NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD OFFICE OF MARINE SAFETY

- - - - - - - - x

Major Marine Accident

Interviews of Investigation:

JAPANESE FISHERIES TRAINING VESSEL, : EHIME MARU :

DCA01MM022

AND

U.S. NAVY NUCLEAR ATTACK SUBMARINE, : USS GREENEVILLE :

Sunday, February 18, 2001 Monday, February 19, 2001

INTERVIEWS OF INVESTIGATION

INTERVIEW OF CAPT KYLE
[ACCOMPANIED BY COMMANDER JOHNSON]

INTERVIEWING PANEL:

National Transportation Safety Board

TED WHITE, Investigator TOM ROTH-ROFFY, Accident Investigator ROBERT HENRY BILL WOODY BARRY STRAUCH, Human Factor Specialist

United States Navy

CDR JOHN CACCIVIO, SUBPAC

United States Coast Guard

LTJG KEN KUSANO LT CHARLIE JOHNSON

[TRANSCRIPT PREPARED FROM A TAPE RECORDING.]

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WHITE: The time is now 11:40 on the 18th of February. We are here now to interview Captain Kyle.

My name is Ted White with the National

Transportation Safety Board as an accident

investigator. Myself and several other Safety Board

members are here to investigate the accident that

occurred between the USS Greeneville and the fishing

vessel, Ehime Maru, on February 9th, 2001.

Sir, I am going to waive reading the rest of the information in regard to the National

Transportation Safety Board because you have been on board --

CAPT KYLE: I understand. I understand the role of the NTSB.

MR. WHITE: Okay. Again, if you desire, you may have another person assist you during this interview. Is that the purpose of Commander Johnson?

CAPT KYLE: Yes. I have asked Commander

Johnson, who is my principal assistant for at-sea

training, to help me, if there is a question about

procedures or read some particular procedure, he has

brought some books along to help me with getting down

to the right element, to get the detail, and he is also an experienced submarine officer, he may be able to shed some light on some of the questions you may have here.

MR. WHITE: All right. Thank you.

Again, this is Mr. White. What we will do is I will ask the questions, and then we will pass on to the other parties here.

Sir, I would like to start off with a description of on the 9th of February, what were your duties and what position were you actually filling in the command structure?

CAPT KYLE: Okay. This is Captain Kyle from COMSUBPAC, United States Navy.

My job, my job, I work for the Commander,
Submarine Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet as the deputy chief
of staff for Tactics and Training. I am one of the
senior submarine officers on the staff.

The staff has several post commanding officers, 06 captains, but a handful of post major command captains, and I am one of those small, that handful of people that are post major command, that being a squadron command here at Pearl Harbor, and as such, I was informed on that day I was the acting chief

of staff for SUBPAC, because Captain Brandhuber, who is the chief of staff designate or the actual chief of staff assigned, was underway on USS Greeneville for escorting distinguished visitors for at-sea and orientation cruise.

So, although I was acting chief of staff, I, for most of the day, was working in my office on my normal business. I made contact with the front office, the people who run the front office, the chief of staff's office, to see if there was anything pressing during the morning.

There was not, so I was working in my office, which is remote from the headquarters office of SUBPAC, it is a different building, about 200 yards away. It is on the same base, a short distance down the road.

At about 2 o'clock, 1400, on the 9th of

February I was called by the flag secretary, one of the

front office, the admiral's personal assistants, at

1400, informing me that there was an accident -
incident that had occurred, and my presence was

required in the command center.

So, I immediately stopped what I was doing and proceeded to the command center. I probably arrived there about 1400, so he called me a little bit

in advance of that, and was quickly briefed, as I walked in the building, briefed on the nature of the accident, that one of our submarines, the Greeneville, had collided with a fishing boat, and the fishing boat sunk, and that the chief of staff -- I was reminded that the chief of staff, Captain Brandhuber, was on board, and I should point out also that the admiral, Admiral Konetzni, the actual commander of the Submarine Force Pacific Fleet was on temporary duty in Japan that was remote from the headquarters.

In the normal course of things then, with the admiral remote, the day-to-day operation of the Submarine Force falls on the responsibility of the chief of staff, and my being the acting chief of staff, that thrust me into the overall responsibility for day-to-day operations of the Submarine Force.

So, I was quickly brought up to speed on that up in the upstairs area, the entrance to the headquarters, proceeded immediately down to the command center, which I think you have seen is down on the -- you enter the headquarters on the second deck, and the command center is on the ground floor.

So, we went downstairs to the command center and entered, and obviously, there was a lot going on

down there. It took a few minutes to kind of understand how things were working there, the communications were going on.

The deputy chief of staff for operations,

Captain Bill Winney [ph] basically was in charge of the command center. He is a counterpart of mine on the same level in the organization. He is also post command, post major command captain.

It was clear that he was in charge of immediate response. He was taking reports from the scene, from the Greeneville, and coordinating notification of the Coast Guard and higher naval authority of the accident.

It was clear that we had good communications with the Greeneville on UHF SATCOM, satellite communications on the UHF frequency. They were making normal reports. We did not have direct communications on marine radio from the headquarters out to that site. It is a VHF circuit and a little too far away, so we were not hearing VHF COMs in the command center, but Greeneville was relaying what they knew on the satellite communications network.

We did have an open line, had one person on telephone direct line to the Coast Guard rescue center,

so there was a direct line to the Coast Guard. The command center was filled with people. There were a lot of people around, somewhat confused status I guess. Everybody was functioning, but there was a lot of talking going on obviously in that one space.

I got a brief from Commander Captain Winney on who had been notified. As was stated in one of the other interviews, the normal process in the Navy for notifying higher authority up to the leadership of the Navy, the CNO level, is through OPREP, Operational Reporting message system.

I was informed that the initial voice report, which is required within five minutes of an incident, had been made, and that a follow-up report was being transmitted, which is required in 20 minutes up the chain of command, that the Coast Guard was notified and there was sorteeing aircraft and boats to the scene, that we had also sorteed two torpedo recovery craft from Pearl Harbor sub base to respond to the casualty.

They are fairly high speed boats, small boats. I think you have seen those, small craft, to help in the search and recovery or SAR effort, and I was fairly satisfied with the status. Those are the immediate acts that I considered of concern that that

was happening.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The message I then conveyed to the boat I wanted, the information I immediately wanted to receive was status of survivors and the status of the Greeneville itself, was the Greeneville safe or in danger of sinking or further damage.

Quickly found out the Greeneville was, in fact, stable on the surface, not taking on water, and that conditions were nominal. They did report that there was a potential problem with the shaft, there may have been some linkage around the shaft seals, the shaft seals being the interface between the shaft and the hull where the shaft penetrates the hull, keeps water out of the ship around where the shaft goes through the hull, but that was controllable, and not threatening, that there was some apparent imbalance in the shafting area that was limiting the propulsion, the speed that the Greeneville could proceed, but that there was no reason that she could not stay, there was no urgent requirement to send help to her to rescue or to save that ship or to abandon ship, or do anything like that.

The second thing was survivors. I was a little bit frustrated with that at first because we

didn't know, it was difficult finding out how many survivors were in the water, anybody floating, anybody in the water, anybody in life rafts, and I didn't understand at the time why that was delayed, but I understand now, in retrospect, I believe I understand why the report was not as rapid coming because I -- I, you know, was envisioning these open rafts, but, in fact, there, of course, are canopies over the top, and it was difficult to see inside each raft and count individuals in the rafts, and I understand what they were trying -- they were trying to -- finally, the report came back, they have at least 14 people, and I didn't understand that exactly, I do now, at least 14 people recovered to lifeboats, life rafts.

That is what that meant to me in thinking about it in hindsight, that means that's the number of people they could count, but there could be other, additional people under the canopies that they couldn't see, and that they saw no one in the water at that point, that all searching of the water area indicated no one present afloat, adrift, or whatever.

The second issue was raised, is there anybody in distress, you know, obvious distress, and a report came back there is no one in obvious distress,

everybody seems to be in the boats that we can see, any of the survivors are in lifeboats and are stable.

So, the next question was to try to figure out how many crew were there on the manifest, the sailing list, and how many survivors were accounted for in the boats, and I conveyed that out to both the Coast Guard and to the Greeneville.

That was my next priority is to figure out how many, to try to take accountability of the folks that were on that boat, and the report came back from the Greeneville that they had talked to some of the survivors in the lifeboats, but because of the language barrier, they were unable to transfer information.

They were not able to convey the question or get the response as to the number of the crew, the number on board versus the number in the boats, how many were missing, or so forth.

And we were working through that and I was in the process of calling the Coast Guard, asking them if they had any Japanese-speaking people that could go out to the scene because it became clear to me that we were dealing -- at that point I didn't know for sure what the name of the boat was or nationality of the vessel -- it became clear that -- I think the Greeneville said

they were talking Chinese, and I said it's unlikely, it is probably Japanese, and I asked them, are you sure it's not Japanese, they said, yes, we think it's Japanese.

And then right after that, or right in that same time frame came back the name of the vessel, which was really the Greeneville reported that they had read the name of the school - the Uwajima Fisheries High School, which was a real question in our mind, what did that mean, what is that.

You know, that doesn't sound like the name of a ship, it seems like the name of a school, so I am trying to figure that out, and I immediately detailed someone to look in the Internet to see if they could find a vessel with that name or what size vessel was it, picture, or so forth, to get the details, see if there is any information on the Internet, and somebody smartly sat down and got on the Internet and was starting to do some homework.

At that time, the Coast Guard came back with the real name of the ship based on the EPERB, receiving EPERB response, and they notified me of the actual name of the ship, and we didn't know what to say, you know, it was Uwajima Fisheries School or is it the name, you

know, Ehime Maru, we didn't know what to put, so we put both of them in the messages forwarding them up the line.

And about in that same time frame, the first Coast Guard helo arrived on scene and also confirmed they saw no -- and we got this through the Coast Guard by telephone from the helicopter -- that they didn't see anybody adrift, no one not in a lifeboat on initial survey by the Coast Guard helo.

The Coast Guard was saying that they really needed TWRs out there because they felt like there may be too many people to recover to the boats that the Coast Guard was dispatching, so we gave them an ETA. We contacted the TWRs for an ETA to the site, it was about 25 to 30 minutes from where they were.

They were in communication with the TWRs, and so they were on their way out, and then based on my recollection is the next thing, the next major event that occurred was the fact that the Coast Guard crewmen, the boats arrived on scene and had recovered, we are still in doubt as to how many survivors, and the big piece of information was that the Coast Guardsmen had arrived at the raft or the life raft that had the captain, the master on board, and he was able to convey

that there were 35 souls on board when they left and that he counted 25 survivors.

That was later, in about 5 or 10 minutes, amended to say it was actually 26 survivors. I think, as I understand it, he forgot to count himself, and so it was really 26. So, we knew we were missing 9 folks, and at that point in time, that was conveyed, as all this information was becoming common knowledge, this was being conveyed up the chain of command and follow-up message traffic up to -- up our chain of command by the OPREP reporting system.

The Coast Guard, the Coast Guard cutter, and the RIB arrived, and they said we can get a -- they indicated that they were going to evacuate the survivors back to Sand Island. I was happy about that, that they were able to do that, and we didn't have to do that with the TWRs.

We were trying to figure out -- to ensure,

TWRs don't typically go to Sand Island, so I was

worried that they even had charts on board to go there.

I figured they did, but I was trying to find out if

they had any problem going into Sand Island, whether

they had ever been there, whatever.

We had a senior naval officer onboard,

Commander Ergins [ph] was out there as kind of the OTC, if you will, officer in tactical control of the TWR or TWRs, so I felt confident that he would back up the coxswains if they had to go into someplace they didn't know, not familiar with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But the Coast Guard said we are recovering them to Sand Island, the survivors, and they were underway back there. In the meantime, we were in the process of trying to -- I was kind of walking -- I was getting updates in the command center. Commander Captain Winney was pretty much in charge of notifications, writing messages. He was briefing me periodically on what actions we knew and didn't know, and I was walking between the command center and the upstairs area where we were busily trying to notify -trying to notify the families of the submarine that there had been an accident, so they didn't hear about it on the news first, so working sort of some of the other issues, the family issues associated with the incident with some folks upstairs who were on the phones there in the Public Affairs Office to convey the initial the public affairs notification.

So, my guesstimate is I would spend, you know, 10 minutes in the command center, and then I

would spend 3 minutes upstairs or 4 minutes getting an update on what is going on in that group, and Commander Carpenter, who is flag secretary, and the public affairs officer and chaplain were up there working the issues with the families and notification issues.

Now, about that time when the Coast Guard was on station, I think it was about 15 -- as I recall, 1503 was when it was logged, I talked to the Coast Guard, the RCC, and asked them if they felt like they had enough assets on station to take charge of the SAR.

Obviously, they are better equipped, better trained to manage the SAR over a long period of time, and I wanted to transfer that responsibility formally to the Coast Guard, and I think it was 1503 I got agreement that they had -- they had enough information, they knew the status of the casualty, they had all, enough assets out there to assume SAR duties, so at 1503, I got agreement that they were now responsible for the search and rescue efforts, and we would be in a supportive role, standing by to render whatever assistance we needed.

I did get permission -- I asked them if they needed the Greeneville to stay out there, if she was an essential portion of the SAR effort. My concern with

Greeneville is I knew the Greeneville is not, as has been discussed numerous -- many people had many questions about the suitability of Greeneville as a search and rescue platform or recovery vessel, not the best vessel, hard, small cockpit, hard to look from the bridge, periscopes give you limited field of view, have a big ship out there, not very maneuverable on the surface, and so I was wondering if it would not be better to get her out of the way or put her off on the side someplace where she could be of some help, but I didn't want her -- I was concerned that she might be in the way of the active recovery of the vessels on scene, so I was talking to the Coast Guard about releasing her from the active SAR business and putting her in some other role or possibly bring her back, because I didn't know for sure -- I did get the report there was no injuries on the Greeneville, but wasn't sure about this material issue, whether it was lingering or there is any issues, water, she was actually taking on water at that point or not and the control rate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I will tell you my thinking at the time was if there was enough assets out there that I would bring the Greeneville back that afternoon, that was overridden, even thought of that, that consideration

was overridden at fleet headquarters. They wanted the Greeneville to stay out.

In fact, we got notification at that point that CINCPAC fleet was sorteeing two additional naval vessels, Salvor and one of the cruisers, I guess it was Lake Erie or Port Royal, I can't remember which one, it was brought back and forth, I don't remember which ship actually ended up responding, one of the cruisers here was also responding.

They wanted Greenville to stay out and be able to help in whatever regard, and I said that's fine, no problem. I knew that Greeneville had gone to sea with a reduced crew. We called out to the ship to make sure they had sufficient watchstanders to competently operate the ship overnight, and they did.

I also asked the status of the visitors onboard, because they are non -- recognizing that the non-military folks on board would probably react traumatically -- I mean everybody reacted traumatically, but they may not understand and maybe really -- because they are really in a foreign environment for themselves -- that they might be reacting, you know, very negatively or having a very difficult time with this at sea.

So, I checked on their status to make sure they were okay, and Captain Brandhuber got back to me on that and said that there was some trauma and some limited hysteria among some of the guests, but they were calming down and working hard to -- they were worried about their own sinking and their own loss of life, and everything, radiation exposure, and geez, we are really going to -- you know, very -- they were fearing for their own lives, and those fears were allayed in short order, and so it looked like everything was stable on the Greeneville and it was fine to keep her out overnight, and that was the decision.

That is really the immediate part. After that, when the Coast Guard was conducting the search and recovery, we were continuing to notify the chain of command of what was going on. Our TWRs were out there, we were talking to them. They were involved in the search during the night, as well.

TWRs really are into the [inaudible] of SUBPAC. They are the submarine base here, NSSE, so they really are a little asset, went out there. The whole effort went to sort of a status keeping thing. That was really the significant portion of the

immediate response.

We then became a supportive role in the incident, and the decision was made to bring back Greeneville the next morning sometime, and Admiral Konetzni got on the next plane, flew back to Pearl Harbor to basically take charge of the casualty after that.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Captain.

Just to confirm the events that you have described, obviously, you have been very much involved in the events since then, but that was your understanding of events as they transpired based on you being there?

CAPT KYLE: Yes. I was there in the command center. The times and the sequence of how everything fell together, I can't say that that was in order. You are going to have to look. We did make sure there was an audio log being kept and a written log for a detailed chronology, what happened and in what order, and you have to refer to that for the actual chronology.

I have kind of summarized what happened based on my memory of the significant events, but I can't tell you, at this point I can't remember which thing

happened first exactly or the exact times. You will have to look at the logs.

If you don't have those, all that information, we should be able to get that, too, because there was an audio recording being made of all the reports and a written log also maintained of everything that went on in that command center.

MR. WHITE: Yes, and we have through
Lieutenant Hedrick made sure that that was one of the
things that was requested.

My question is really geared more towards obviously you have been involved in all our briefings since then, but the information you relayed just now was basically information as you received it.

CAPT KYLE: Right. The only thing is, as I said, I didn't understand at the time why they were giving me this report of greater than 14 people. It seems like an odd report at the time. I didn't go back and say what do you mean by greater than 14.

I took the report. I didn't want to bother them with that, I mean okay, at least 14, and now I understand, based on what I have learned since then, I understand why they are saying greater than 14, because they couldn't -- 14 is what they could actually see in

terms of physical bodies, they couldn't see down in the 1 2 bottoms of boats, and stuff like that. 3 MR. WHITE: You mentioned that the admiral 4 was actually TAD. Does the Navy chain of command mean 5 that you were basically then acting COMSUBPAC? 6 CAPT KYLE: Yes. Captain Brandhuber became 7 Acting COMSUBPAC when the admiral left, and then when 8 Captain Brandhuber went to sea, I was designated as the 9 acting chief of staff, and thereby the acting --10 MR. WHITE: COMSUBPAC. 11 CAPT KYLE: COMSUBPAC. 12 MR. WHITE: You mentioned when you first got 13 the word from the front office and came to the 14 operations area, you were brought up to speed quickly, initially, up on the second deck before you went to the 15 16 op center. 17 Who brought you up to speed on that? 18 CAPT KYLE: Let's see, I think that was 19 Commander Carpenter, the flag secretary. He is sort of 20 the administrative head. He kind of runs the flag 21 office, but the flag office is right above the command center, so he had been downstairs and he was the one 22

accident, and, you know, when I walked in the door, I

who called me, notified me that there had been an

23

24

ran into him basically and he gave me a quick understanding of what was going on.

MR. WHITE: With regard to you mentioned you established a line, and kept the line open through the Coast Guard rescue center.

What was your understanding as to which rescue center, be it the group, be it the joint RCC?

CAPT KYLE: I don't know. My understanding, I only know I was talking to the Coast Guard and I had actually got on the phone with the individual to talk to there about a couple things, and it was pretty clear to me. I didn't know where that phone call was terminated, I knew it was the Coast Guard link, and it was obviously somebody who knew a lot about SAR, you know, they were ready to go, and they were on line, so there was no doubt in my mind we had found the right --

MR. WHITE: Did you initiate the call or was that already established when you got there?

CAPT KYLE: It was already established when I got there, so there was no doubt. It seemed to me like we had, we were getting good status, the person on the other end was very responsive, and when we asked a question, the question came back quickly. It was not one of these things where you waited 10 minutes for an

answer.

I mean there was no doubt in my mind that we were at the -- we had found the right desk, and I didn't go into how did we figure out if it was the right place. It didn't even cross my mind, it was working.

MR. WHITE: You mentioned a couple of times the confusion between whether it was a school or what it was, and I think you have already answered this, but when did you actually learn which vessel it was, or how did you?

CAPT KYLE: Well, the ship reported the Uwajima Fisheries High School because they had seen that on the transom or someplace as the ship was sinking when they looked by visual observation. I believe they even said through the periscope or I assume through the periscope, when they looked at the ship, they read that, spelled it out over the radio.

And then, oh, the Coast Guard and -- I am trying to remember here -- the Coast Guard reported the EPERB registry, the code or whatever is on the EPERB across to the Ehime Maru, and then the CONGEN also reported that it was, I guess based on the Uwajima Fisheries High School.

I believe that report came via the Coast Guard, that the Consul General said it was the Ehime Maru, so I was kind of beginning to believe that.

Then, we looked up that -- we started out on the Uwajima Fisheries High School, got no luck on the Internet.

We went with the other name, and we got the picture of the boat and a little bit of detail about it, and it became -- I figured it out during the process what it was. I was trying to figure out what this all meant, and I realized, I kind of understood it's really in our parlance it's a vocational school, and, you know, understanding that there is a difference in the education process in Japan, I knew enough about the system over there, that high school didn't mean high school like in our terminology.

It's a difference in translation, and it really was a vocational school for those who are not going on to university, they are going to take up this vocation, and it kind of made sense to me that there is a different name. The vessel's name was such and such, but it was contracted or part of this school.

MR. WHITE: I understand.

CAPT KYLE: It started to come together.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

MR. WHITE: When you first came into the op center, there was communications with the Greeneville via this HICOM, I assume.

CAPT KYLE: Right.

MR. WHITE: Who, could you tell who was on the other end of this HICOM?

CAPT KYLE: There were various speakers on there. There was a consistent speaker. I did talk to the chief of staff, Captain Brandhuber -- I didn't talk to him, I don't think I talked on that circuit at all, but I did hear conversations between Captain Brandhuber and -- that's the only voice that I really recognized as being -- that I could identify to a particular individual.

MR. WHITE: We didn't get the opportunity for a variety of reasons, obviously, to actually hear conversations on the SATHICOM. Is it good enough quality where you can recognize voices if you know them?

CAPT KYLE: Pretty good. It is an encrypted circuit, so obviously, the voice is somewhat garbled, a little bit distorted by the encryption, but I could tell Captain Brandhuber's voice, I recognized it. It is clear enough that if you deal with someone on a

common basis, you can recognize the speech pattern, and the tone is a little different, but you can recognize a person.

MR. WHITE: You mentioned OPREP as far as the message reporting system. When we were over at the COM center, they mentioned that it came in as an OPREP 3 or 4.

CAPT KYLE: Right, OPREP 3 navy blue. OPREP 3 -- there is different OPREPS -- OPREP 3 is a significant incident reporting code. That is what it means. This was a report of a significant incident. There are others. There is OPREP 1's and 2's, 5's. I can't even remember what all those things mean.

The most common one we use, that we use, that a ship would initiate, would be an OPREP 3, which is a significant incident, and then the Navy Blue in code means that's a -- it's within the Navy. There are two basic OPREP 3's, Navy Blue and Pinnacle. Navy Blue goes to the Navy Command Center, Washington, D.C. Pinnacle goes to the National Command Center.

It doesn't mean that the National Command

Center doesn't get notified, it's just that it's more

direct, so it went to the Navy Command Center, and

somewhere in the middle of the casualty, we were

directed to change to the Pinnacle reporting format, that the Navy Center had forwarded our reports up to the national level.

There is a matrix that tells you certain types of incidents should be, you know, what level it should be reported.

MR. WHITE: In the log as we were reviewing it over there at the OPCEN, there is reference to completing the checklist, and this may be where we start getting into a couple of things as far as completing the checklist for a collision from OPBOR of 201.

CAPT KYLE: Right.

MR. WHITE: What would have been involved in that?

CAPT KYLE: Primarily an OPBOR of 201, it talks about what type of information you are supposed to try to receive. You know, obviously, in a casualty like this, people become a little bit shaken, and your memory of what you are supposed to -- important data you are supposed to get.

For most casualties like this, we will have sort of a memory aid, I guess, to help you through all of the items that you should remember to get, and there

was a lieutenant or a watchstander in the command center that had that checklist broken out. That is one thing I did notice.

When I tell you it was kind of confused down there, it was sort of orderly confusion, a lot of -- you can imagine -- a lot of talking and a lot of information, people trying to, you know, the biggest weakness I guess would be everybody is trying to talk at the same time, and people can't -- can't hear at the same time, but everybody was very industrious in terms of everybody had a job.

There is people doing the checklist and checking things off, reading the things and marking off and taking action to get that checklist done.

MR. WHITE: Does that checklist include besides what information to get to be able to relay out what actions to be taken in response or perhaps potential resources to assist or anything of that sort?

CAPT KYLE: To be honest with you, I don't know for sure. I can't tell you what is on the checklist specifically. I assume there is a good checklist. I have never really studied the checklist to tell you what is really on there.

You know, I just -- I know how those

checklists are generated. You know, it is some staff officer, you know, tries to accumulate, get the lessons learned and accumulate all the requirements and it in one place, and I had confidence that the people who have that for a living are doing a good job with that and it's a good checklist.

MR. WHITE: You say you wanted to bring the Greeneville in, yet, it was overridden.

CAPT KYLE: Uh-huh.

MR. WHITE: Overridden by whom?

CAPT KYLE: Well, I was considering bringing her in. I was trying to think about it. It was overridden by the Fleet Headquarters. The Fleet Command Center, [inaudible] CINCPAC Fleet was listening to this on the -- listening to all our discussions on the SATHICOM.

They also listened, monitor the Satellite

HICOM, and they heard that discussion. Then, the phone

call came down. This is Admiral Fargo. I believe

Admiral Fargo himself said leave Greeneville out unless

there is a urgent need to bring her in, in other words,

unless there is any compelling reason to --

MR. WHITE: So, you didn't go up to ask advice. That direction came down based on what they

were overhearing on the SATHICOM.

CAPT KYLE: Correct. I would have -- you know, I was in the process of getting release, getting Greeneville released, I would have asked for concurrence on that before I even -- before I had actually brought her in. I wouldn't have brought her in without getting concurrence of CINCPAC Fleet.

MR. WHITE: How did Greeneville feel about it or the chief of staff when you were in discussions?

emotions. The chief of staff felt that the families, the visitors on board were a little bit rattled and that it would be good to get them off as soon as possible, but obviously, an at-sea transfer was out of the question. The only way to get them off the ship was bring them into Pearl Harbor or some sheltered area.

He would like, in that sense, he would have liked to get them off because they were very upset, and the families, their families were going to be concerned, and so on, and so on, and at first, the ship, it was unclear what the status of the shaft seal was.

That became clear, and after that became more

understood what it was and it was not threatening, there was no resistance at all about staying out there, in fact, they said we will stay as long as it takes.

So, we were trying to -- along that line, I forgot to mention it, that was another issue that the personnel side, the upstairs portion that were working on the notification of the family members, and so forth, we were also trying to get the next of kin data together for the visitors, so that their families could be notified that they were okay and safe, and not in any danger.

MR. WHITE: That is not something that is routinely provided when you go out on a --

CAPT KYLE: Oh, yeah, they do provide that data, we were just getting it together and making the calls to their families to let them know that this accident occurred, but their loved one or whatever was okay.

MR. WHITE: Who initiated the Navy aircraft launch? Who was controlling that?

CAPT KYLE: That was also launched by -- that was launched by CINCPAC Fleet. The directions, the sortee, the cruiser, and the Salvor and the aircraft was all controlled at the CINCPAC Fleet level.

1	MD WHITE: How wore they graphed into the
	MR. WHITE: How were they cranked into the
2	loop, through the message traffic?
3	CAPT KYLE: Like I say, they have a command
4	center. The SATHICOM is on a speaker, so they can
5	basically hear, everybody is listening to that. You
6	can hear all conversations, and obviously, this
7	happened right there.
8	MR. WHITE: Were the also talking on the
9	SATHICOM?
10	CAPT KYLE: No, no, they did not talk. I
11	don't remember them ever saying anything.
12	MR. WHITE: So, in the primary COMs between
13	the submarine and shore were to COMSUBPAC.
14	CAPT KYLE: Yes.
15	MR. WHITE: The fleet or CINCPAC never got
16	involved directly.
17	CAPT KYLE: No. Exactly how they sorteed or
18	what phone call or what buttons they pushed to sortee
19	those ships and aircraft, I don't know how they did
20	that exactly. You would have to go up there and talk.
21	We can get those people to come down there and look at
22	their procedures for sorteeing that.
23	As I understand it, that cruiser was a duty

standby response cruiser for contingencies, and so she

24

1	was in somewhat heightened manning and readiness to get
2	underway, and she was able to respond fairly quickly.
3	Salvor, that was also fairly, you know, fairly rapid
4	response I thought for, you know, plus getting,
5	recalling all her sailors, getting away for a Friday
6	afternoon. You expect by 1500 in the afternoon on
7	Friday, most of the crew had gone home if they could
8	have, so they had to get people back in.
9	MR. WHITE: So, Salvor was not under any kind
10	of a heightened readiness status
11	CAPT KYLE: I couldn't tell you that. I
12	don't know that for a fact, I don't know.
13	Excuse me. Could we go off the record for a
14	second? I have got this phone call coming in here.
15	[Off the record.]
16	MR. WHITE: This is Ted White. We are back
17	on the record. In the interest of the noon meal, shall
18	I say, we are going to change the order of questioning.
19	Mr. Henry from the NTSB will follow me.
20	Captain, I have just one additional question
21	at this time, and that is, you said you knew that they
22	were underway with a reduced crew. Did you know that
23	ahead of time, or was that part of information when

did you receive that information?

24

1	CAPT KYLE: I received that information in
2	the command center, that they told me that they had
3	left a substantial portion of their crew behind and
4	that after they got underway. I wasn't aware of that
5	beforehand, and I found out how many people that were
6	there. That is why I asked, to make sure they had
7	enough given that factor, did they have enough
8	people to sustain a competent watch. I figured they
9	did, but I just needed to make sure that that was not
10	an open issue.
11	MR. WHITE: And who did you get confirmation
12	from that there was enough
13	CAPT KYLE: From the ship itself.
14	MR. WHITE: That is all I have at this time.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. HENRY: Robert Henry speaking.
17	Captain Kyle, did we ask you what your normal
18	duties are when you are not acting chief of staff?
19	CAPT KYLE: Yes. I said I was deputy chief
20	of staff for Training and Tactical Readiness.
21	MR. HENRY: Training and Tactical Readiness.
22	Just one question on training. My
23	understanding was that the Greeneville had been in the
24	yard for an extended period of time and had been out

for about a month.

CAPT KYLE: Correct.

MR. HENRY: After the vessel has been out of service for a while and coming back into service, are there any required drills, training to be conducted when getting underway?

CAPT KYLE: Okay. I need to step back just a little bit and explain to you a little bit how we, in fact, execute the -- how we oversee and do training in the Submarine Force.

Although my title is deputy chief of staff for Tactics and Training, that is really a programmatic oversight of what programs we have in place, what training is being formally structured and bought, what training devices are available, what schools do we maintain for our sailors, and I do have a tactical training arm which Commander Johnson is in charge of.

He does go out and periodically ride and inspect submarines, crews, but the direct individual responsible for the day-to-day training and readiness, the overseer of any given ship, submarine force is the squadron commander, and the squadron commander reports directly to Admiral Konetzni. In this case, it's Captain Richneed [ph], the commander of Submarine

Squadron 1 is responsible for the oversight of the day-to-day readiness and training of USS Greeneville.

So, that being said, on an ongoing day-to-day basis, he is really responsible for ensuring the Greeneville -- serves a back-up to the commanding officer -- the Greeneville remains ready and competent to go to sea.

Now, this period that they were involved with, this maintenance period was -- I don't know the exact time, it was probably a 70-day, 70-, 75-day off-line status, and that is speculation.

It was what we refer to as an SRA, Selected Restricted Availability. They are specifically designed, those availabilities are designed to be limited in length for a couple of reasons. One is cost, but another reason is exactly the issue you speak to, is to minimize the time the ship is off-line, so that the training recovery program is not as significant as an extended yard availability. That is one of the factors on why it is as short as it is.

The idea is to get it in, get the ship in, get some things done, improvements, modernization, required maintenance to get it back out, back on the line as quickly as we can without incurring a large

cost in either fiscal dollars or large training recovery costs.

So, my experience is that while there is some atrophying of skills while you are in one of these 60-day or 75-day availabilities, it is not -- it is not a significant loss of capability, so that if you were in -- the Navy's program is if you were in a shipyard, a longer shipyard period, there is a very formal crew certification process of examination and recertification of the crew's readiness to return to sea and become competent and basically allowed to conduct unrestricted operations.

In this short, two-month availability period, it is more or less a refresher training period, go out, step through the process, make sure the damage control program, and so forth, for the crew is up to speed.

They will typically run some fire drills, flooding drills, make sure everybody knows where they need to go, make sure the equipment is still on board, in fact, they will do a fast cruise, they will run through drills and casualties before they get underway, usually 24 hours in length, they will just do it alongside the pier, shut the hatches, pretend that they are underway, and run through some -- a good, a good

set of -- they will practice just the underway portion.

They will run it like a day at sea with some drills in there, and everybody will go through a set of specific evolutions to kind of get ready, and they will go out, and depending on the degree of maintenance, how many people have changed, the squadron commander may elect to take some oversight out there, some of his staff to kind of oversee and review the operation of the ship and give comment, criticism to the CO, those things that are not working as well as it should be and need addressing.

Now, whether that happened in this particular case, I don't know, and I don't follow that on every ship, because it really is, as I say, the responsibility and requirement of the squadron commander to make that assessment, how much is the experience been -- how much of the experience on the ship has been lost during the maintenance availability and what is the required action to get the ship back up on the line completely.

MR. HENRY: Thank you, Captain. Captain, you have been a source of information since we have been here on submarine procedures, policies, practices that have helped us focus our efforts, and in particular, in

your briefings at the evening progress meetings.

Now that we are on the record, I do have one question or several questions, and if you feel that you are not the appropriate person to address those, please say so, and it concerns the practice of carrying civilians on the Greeneville and that class of submarine, and in particular, has there been — is there something established in writing as far as the maximum number of civilians that can be carried on a demonstration cruise?

CAPT KYLE: I don't believe there is. I don't know that. I may not be the right guy to answer that question. I personally don't know of that. I am not saying there is not.

There has been over my career in the service, been discussion about that. To the best of my knowledge, there is no fixed number. I will try and find that. I will go to work, get my people to look at that, but there has been -- there have been cases where some general guidance has been given on taking non-military people to sea on ships to ensure that the proper degree of control can be maintained, that the ship can be operated safely without the number of non-military people on there is limited to the point

where the ship can continue to perform safely, to operate the ship properly, and there is enough safety appliances on board for everybody who is there.

MR. HENRY: And my question is, just for the record, if we could identify whether there is anything published in the way of an instruction or reference to a study, or some effort that somebody actually thought through the maximum number in sort of the way you have just explained, to make sure that the sub's capabilities aren't compromised and that it can still operate safely.

CAPT KYLE: So, you would like any written guidance that exists?

MR. HENRY: Written guidance that exists, and if it was based on any sort of a study or any sort of a study on the safe level of the number of occupants in the control room at one time, which would basically be the crew and then add to that the number of civilian guests that would still allow the vessel to operate up to its required level of efficiency and safety.

CAPT KYLE: Okay.

MR. HENRY: With Captain Brandhuber underway, you said you were acting chief of staff and I guess in effect acting COMSUBPAC, what was your understanding of

the role and responsibilities of Captain Brandhuber on the Greeneville?

CAPT KYLE: My understanding was that he, as an escort, provides liaison between the group and the crew, to answer questions, to try to lift some of the burden of interface, keep people informed, and off the backs of the crew, so they can focus on operation of the ship and to help in that regard, help the ship in running the demonstration program and to keep things flowing, to provide advice to the captain on who these people were and what things might be appropriate to show or not show, provide some historical background and maybe the captain himself, because the captain would be the next senior person on the ship, may not understand or have understanding of.

That is his primary -- that is why he went out, to provide that liaison.

MR. HENRY: And to your knowledge, did his role change after the collision?

CAPT KYLE: No, he continued in that function, in fact, he was very helpful. I mean if he hadn't been there, he basically helped with the -- as I mentioned, there was some limited hysteria -- he helped quell that. Otherwise that role would have fallen on

the backs of the ship. The ship was obviously involved in trying to find survivors and trying to respond to the casualty topside, so helped with that significantly.

He provided a very good perspective,
high-level perspective. He did speak on the radio and
talk about status, and that relieved the captain of
having to make those kind of reports that he might want
to make, command level reports.

So, he functioned in that -- continued to function in that role. He was the sort of the liaison and senior person out there to help with kind of organize your thoughts. I am sure the commanding officer was very much rattled by the collision, recognized that he was responsible in some fashion for that in some way and to have someone there to kind of keep things experienced, a little more experienced person, a few more years, to make sure the right priorities are set on the ship, it was probably very helpful.

MR. HENRY: Thank you.

CAPT KYLE: That is all speculation. That's

23 not --

MR. HENRY: I prefaced it based on to your

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

understanding. 1 2 You had mentioned the required reports that 3 should come at 5 and 20 minutes. Those are verbal? 4 CAPT KYLE: Verbal report in 5 minutes, and a 5 written report in 20. 6 MR. HENRY: The written is a message format? 7 CAPT KYLE: Yes. There is a template for 8 It tells you what things you are supposed to report, checklist format. 9 10 MR. HENRY: With the chronology of the 11 accident occurring sometime around 1345, and the responsibilities being passed to the Coast Guard for 12 13 SAR at 1503, we are talking about an hour and 15 14 minutes? 15 CAPT KYLE: And hour and how many? An hour and 20 minutes. 16 17 MR. HENRY: Twenty minutes? An hour and 20 18 minutes. What precisely was the role of the communication center, were you doing just COMs or were 19 20 you doing search planning? 21 CAPT KYLE: No. At that point, at that point 22 we were trying to -- my focus on that was to ensure, to

minimize, make sure, first things first, and that was

to make sure that there was nobody in distress, and if

23

24

there was somebody in distress, to afford assistance there as soon as possible, and that was my priorities.

The second thing was to get -- make sure the Coast Guard and recovery forces, who could better respond to the search and rescue effort, were really professionals at this stuff, were coming on scene, because I knew the accident occurred close to Honolulu and that the deployment time from the Coast Guard station at Sand Island would be fairly short and I wanted to make sure they were enroute as soon as possible.

We are not -- we are not set up really to organize or run a search and rescue effort for a long period of time. That is not our -- we are not, you know, we are not set up to do that. That would not be our normal role in this type of affair.

If we are in the vicinity of some supporting agency, we would again turn it over to the experts as quickly as we could. Obviously, we are the initial people on scene, we are the only guy there, and so I wanted to make sure that the priorities are going right and the information was flowing up, and we can pass that to the Coast Guard.

At the beginning of the casualty, the boat

had reported they were having difficulty talking to the Coast Guard, and eventually it was resolved. I don't know what -- I don't know what caused that problem, so we were sort of the -- we were maintaining the link between the actual scene as it was going on and what the Coast Guard knew at the rescue center.

Eventually, they got -- established some directs COMs there, but -- so that was sort of the -- what I saw the function of our center.

MR. HENRY: So, at 1503, what was passed to the Coast Guard was really the communication responsibilities?

CAPT KYLE: No, the actual search responsibilities, I know they have procedures and methodology for calculating search and, you know, wind blowing, and how to figure all that stuff out, where the search vector go, and what assets are on station and what is the best use of those assets.

I didn't have direct control of that helicopter, I didn't have direct control of those Coast Guard boats coming out there, so, you know, they have all that, MOU set up for support. I mean that is their main, one of their main businesses in life, and they are really the pros at that stuff, we are not.

That is not our main business in life, that is sort of, you know, we do it until we are relieved, and we try to get the Coast Guard, get the experts on scene as quickly as we can.

MR. HENRY: So, prior to 1503, the Coast Guard was not directing any specific search?

CAPT KYLE: I can't say that for sure. I don't know that the helicopter wasn't being directed by the Coast Guard headquarters. I wanted to make it a clear demarcation that I didn't want cross signals to go, I didn't want to be telling somebody to do something, and the Coast Guard telling somebody else to do something else, and therefore, being a confused effort.

So, that is why I wanted to ensure that I was standing down from any direction to any forces. I wasn't going to direct the search and recovery, I was there to support, ready to go, anything they needed from us, and as far as I was concerned, whoever the lead man at the Coast Guard station at the rescue center, was now OTC at the search and recovery.

MR. HENRY: And that included directing the Greeneville and once communications were established and whatever the Coast Guard felt the Greeneville could

contribute to a search?

CAPT KYLE: Absolutely. I would expect the Coast Guard would have asked us to do whatever Greeneville, but if Greeneville was asked directly by one the on-scene people, by channel 16 or whatever circuit they were on, that would have fine. They would have gone after it.

MR. HENRY: I guess my question was did that actually happen, was the Coast Guard directing Greeneville in search efforts?

CAPT KYLE: I kind of assumed they were, but I don't think that actually happened. That's a retrospect thing now that I have talked to some -- heard some of these people ask this question yesterday to the executive officer of the ship whether they were part of a -- given a search area or sector, or given any direction to search specifically, and they said no, but it was clearly stated that we were ready to employ Greeneville to continue the search, she was going to remain on station to conduct search, and it was at the disposal of the Coast Guard station to do so.

MR. HENRY: But the torpedo recovery boats were being directed by the Coast Guard.

CAPT KYLE: Yes, Eventually, when they got

1	out there, they were also turned over to the Coast
2	Guard.
3	MR. HENRY: That's fine. That completes my
4	questions.
5	CAPT KYLE: You see, on the way out, before
6	the Coast Guard was there, we were talking to the Coast
7	Guard, telling them where to go, what core speed, how
8	to get there, and how fast, and once they arrived on
9	station, I definitely wanted the Coast Guard to employ
10	those boats as if they were their own, and I didn't
11	that was the whole purpose of the 1503 turnovers, that
12	those assets are now yours, use them however you need
13	to use them.
14	MR. HENRY: Including the Greeneville.
15	CAPT KYLE: Yes.
16	MR. HENRY: Thank you, Captain.
17	MR. WHITE: We need to stop.
18	
	[Off the record.]
19	MR. WHITE: We are back live. We are going
19 20	
	MR. WHITE: We are back live. We are going
20	MR. WHITE: We are back live. We are going to resume the interview with Captain Kyle. The time is
20 21	MR. WHITE: We are back live. We are going to resume the interview with Captain Kyle. The time is about 0743. The date is the 19th of February, 2001.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

MR. WHITE: Sir, we would like to now turn our interview towards some of the other aspects of your duties as deputy chief of staff.

One of the areas I am interested in is the operational readiness exams that the vessel is subjected to. If you could give us a little bit about that periodicity, types of things that the crew has to demonstrate in terms of proficiency and whether or not some of these evolutions that they were undergoing are, in fact, demonstrated to some sort of an examining board or whatever the term is.

CAPT KYLE: This is Captain Kyle of the United States Navy. The training regimen for a submarine goes over the spectrum of its operation, the operating cycle, so I will start with a very basic concept of how the operating cycle of the submarine goes, and we will start from the completion I would say of major shipyard availability, not one like I was discussing yesterday, a two-month availability, but a major availability, such as new construction of the sub or a major refit, improvement period lasting several months up to a year or more where the ship goes really off-line for a period of time.

The ship would come out of that availability

and go through initial crew certification, which is the way I described that basically is boat is examined by its superiors prior to initial operation or going to sea to check on basic mariner skills, basic submariner skills basically, can they man a competent watch, can they navigate properly, can they maintain depth keeping, do they have adequate propulsion plant operators.

Obviously, all of our ships are nuclear powered, so a lot of our training effort, there is a significant training effort and a certification effort involved in maintaining the currency in the nuclear propulsion plant area. That's a major focus, conditional crew certification, but a similar -- a similar effort is conducted in the tactical or basic mariner skills.

Damage control drills are run. There is a whole regimen laid out in our training -- instruction training manual that discusses the crew certification process and the requirements, and we can provide a copy of those paragraphs to you.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ WHITE: What document is that called again, sir?

CAPT KYLE: Submarine Training, Joint

Training Manual, joint being between the submarine forces in the Pacific and Atlantic, that is why the joint word is in there.

And that involves both shoreside evaluation and then an at-sea evaluation by the ship's immediate superior in command. That is referred to as ISIC. In this case, as I mentioned yesterday, it would be his squadron command infrastructure.

So, once that basically gets the ship out of the shipyard and into some semblance of safe mariner submarining capability. At this point, he is really not what I would consider ready for war or ready for front-line operations. He is basically certified for local operations. It is the first step in getting him back up on the readiness scale to go into forward action, whether a peacetime deployment or war, if it was a wartime or combat situation, to go into ready for combat.

He then goes out and then becomes -- goes
through a series of certifications, and, you know, it's
a real potpourri of different certifications. There
are certifications for salvage, there are
certifications, you know, kind of what I would call
some of them, I don't want to call them less important,

but they are smaller in terms of scope, limited in scope, important in their own right, in their own area, but as far as the overall ship, they are limited scope inspections.

At some point in time, about I think within the first -- correct me if I am wrong, Commander

Johnson -- but it's within the first four to six months coming out of shipyard, it goes through what is called a post-overhaul refresher training period, following by a tactical weapons certification, TWC. I think within about four months is about --

CDR JOHNSON: About four months is correct.

that period, the ship and crew will go through about nominally a two-week intensive training period at one of our submarine training centers, such as will be visited this week, the submarine training center Pacific up on the hill here where the ship control trainer is one of those type of training centers, and they will go through advanced -- I don't want call advanced -- but submarine warfare skills, damage control training, ship control training, various skills in a school environment under the tutelage of instructors, qualified instructors, through a specific

program.

This again is monitored. The progress of this training is monitored by the ship's immediate superior in command, squadron and staff, and that is culminated then by an at-sea evaluation of about a week or maybe perhaps 10 days depending on how things go, but there is again an agenda of things to be examined during that at-sea period and the TWC.

It is during this period we run damage control drills, we run emergency surface -- could run possibly emergency surfacing drills although it may not occur. I mean emergency surfacing may or may not be part of that agenda, but certainly some sort of flooding casualty will be in there.

He will be certified on his weapons, he will be checked out that he is competent to handle, employ, launch his weapon systems. He would be examined in the sonar processing to see that he could track complex targets, difficult tracking targets on an ongoing basis and in a combat situation.

He would be check on sensor employment, periscopes from a tactical standpoint, sort of an advanced level. Some of these things would have been checked in the earlier one, but sort of at a more basic

level, a day-to-day safety level, but at this point now, he is getting -- once he completes this certification, he is considered a full-up round, if you will, ready-to-go, you know, one of the regular ships out here ready for service.

He would be given his initial weapons loadout, and he would be more or less in a -- I guess what you would consider a standby mode for deployment. He wouldn't be ready for deployment, but he could be -- he is now a deployable submarine.

Okay. The next phase from that would be the next step up from there, would be at about the 10- to 12-month period, we would try, after this overhaul period -- we would try to get the ship ready for deployment to the Western Pacific, and at six months prior to that period, six months prior to the deployment date, the ship would enter into what is referred to as the pre-overseas movement period, and that is a dedicated and focused time for the ship, sort of a stand-alone, and we call it the POM period, pre-overseas movement.

Once he enters POM, he becomes a special category boat. He gets special status in our eyes in the management of that submarine, because he is getting

ready for deployment, he gets more focus and attention from the entire infrastructure support in the submarine force.

That includes in area of maintenance, if something breaks, he gets kind of priority, front-of-the-line privilege to get his equipment fixed and maintained. You know, he is sort of a special category, he's in the sun in terms of everybody is paying attention to what he needs and he is getting I guess what you would call front-of-the-line treatment.

During that period, there is a specific regimen of training requirements that have to be accomplished. There is basic POM training, which kind of brings back those same skills that were done in the TWC at that kind of level, you know, strong, but maybe not at the peak level, but, you know, good, healthy training.

They will be doing tracking of different submarines, they will be under periscope depth, they will be looking at damage control capabilities, they will be looking at track and basic kind of contacts, kind of making sure there is no holes in their basic level, bringing them up, anything that isn't quite buffed up to -- you know, is tarnished a little bit or

fallen away, dust off those skills, and then we go into the advanced POM training, which now goes against targets that are -- or contacts or situations that replicate the same level or challenge perhaps that they would have on their deployment.

We kind of focus that now. We are trying to get nearer the deployment day, so that we are really focusing on the teams that will be standing watch together on deployment, the actual people, recognizing that in the Navy, one of our biggest challenges in the training business is we have a very fluid work force, people come and go at a very frequent rate, so we are always, you know, despite the fact back in the TWC, we trained this crew, that crew is not the same in any regard by the time they are in the POM process.

You have lost maybe a quarter to a third of those people who are trained in the TWC are new people when you get into this POM period, and that is just the nature of our business. The average tour length on board a submarine for an enlisted guy may be in the area of four to five years, or some guys may be there even shorter, three years; officers around the ship, maybe for no more than three years.

So, you can see there is a regular role of

people coming and going to the ship, and that does create an ongoing challenge in terms of training.

So, at this advanced -- going back to my story, my timeline -- at the advanced POM training period, we are trying to now -- we have pretty much got -- pretty much with maybe a couple of exceptions -- got the crew on board that is going to deploy with the ship, and we are trying to really develop the on-watch team concept of working together and understanding everybody's strengths, weaknesses, and really developing, you know, gelling the team.

After the advanced POM period, we go out to sea, probably two or three times, and I am a little vague there because -- I am being a little vague because it's not precise, it depends on what the ship is going to be doing, what type of missions, what type of employment.

If a submarine is going to deploy in consort with a battle group, there is an aircraft carrier, there is some training they get to integrate them into that battle group team. If they are going to be an independent deployer, not associated with a battle group, they may have a different slant to their training. It really is kind of customized to what we

expect that ship to be doing during its deployment, and we will focus at-sea events that are designed to challenge the submarine with the same type of challenges that they will see on deployment.

Again, this is organized by the ship's immediate superior in command, and gets a letter basically from us, the submarine's commander, the submarine force, that tells the captain of the ship and his boss, squadron, what specific skills that we expect that ship to have to do on deployment, so if it is off of this letter that they generate the training plan for this POM period.

This is all culminated then by a series of certifications where the actual squadron commander certainly will ride if possible, if he's not conflicted out, he will try, he will get on there sometime during the POM, he will try certainly to ride the POM cert if he can.

A representative of my staff, typically,

Commander Johnson, will ride on those POM certs or

myself, I have ridden several of them myself, to

observe the ship in a deployment replicating scenario.

During those certifications, typically, they are examined in warfare, tracking, and basic mariner

skills, all of which are stretched to the max or tested to the maximum on deployment. That is our product.

That is what we work -- if we were looking at a production line here, as a corporation, our product for the nation is deliver deployable submarines.

So, this is the culmination of all the work, is to get out on deployment, and it is that certification that the squadron commander does in consort with a member of my staff, myself or typically Commander Johnson here.

We huddle at the end of that. We look at all the comments written, all the observations made, and the squadron commander must make the decision and write Admiral Konetzni, the force commander, a letter that says USS Submarine is ready for deployment in all respects, all these areas have been looked at, here are the significant -- any significant issues in any area. The ship is either certified or not certified to go.

Now, and that is a typical workup from a deployment period, from an overhaul or significant maintenance period to deployment. If a ship came back from deployment and did not have one of these big maintenance periods, she would have sort of an abbreviated training period call a tactical weapons

proficiency evaluation, which is of the same scale as that certification, but perhaps not quite as intense because it is assumed that not all of her skills have atrophied.

It would be a little bit -- it would not go so much back to the basics, it would start at a level a little higher than the basics, and then work them back up again to look for any weaknesses and polish up any areas that may be a little tarnished and emphasize to the boat issues.

It would involve a period at the training center, so the training center would work with the crew. It would also involve a period at sea.

So, I think that pretty much -- unless I left something out obvious -- that covers pretty much the training program and how we stay involved with each ship, and these training periods are all laid out in this joint training manual. They talk about how you prepare people - two documents. The joint training manual and the POM are pre-overseas movement instruction.

Unfortunately, the POM overseas movement instruction, because it discusses some details of deployment operations, is classified at the Secret

level, so if you want to look at that, we would probably have to write -- honestly, would have to write some synopsis of -- we could probably show you excerpts of it, show you the detail that it is written in, but it would be very difficult to turn over an exact copy. It would be much abridges, trimmed out.

You would see a lot of tattered papers, because it does discuss, you know, the details of submarine operations to some degree of minutia there, so it would be a tough manual to give you.

But those two documents in consort, plus another book called The Tactical Weapons Proficiency Manual Instruction, give the details of how to conduct one of those evaluations, will have probably have interest to answer your question, you know, in a sense of documentation or programatics.

MR. WHITE: Okay, sir. Barry, I would like to go ahead and give you the opportunity, since you will be leaving, to continue the questioning.

MR. STRAUCH: Captain, good morning.

CAPT KYLE: Good morning.

MR. STRAUCH: I am going to ask kind of broad questions. Were you familiar with or are you familiar with the general submarine tactics, procedures,

evolutions at the time of the Houston accident? 1 2 CAPT KYLE: Yes. 3 MR. STRAUCH: Could you tell me what changes were implemented in procedures, tactics, evolutions as 4 5 a direct result of the Houston accident? 6 CAPT KYLE: Oh, I am sorry, you asked about 7 the Houston accident? 8 MR. STRAUCH: Yes. 9 I am lightly familiar with that. CAPT KYLE: 10 I am sorry, I was -- I thought you were saying the Greeneville accident -- but the Houston accident. 11 I am 12 familiar with the general circumstances of that 13 accident, however, I was not in a position to tell you, I was much more junior, it was 10 years ago, I was just 14 going to command my own ship, so for me to recall what 15 programmatic changes were made as a result of that 16 17 collision, it would be a stretch for me. I don't know 18 that I can remember back. If I struggle here for a 19 little bit, I might remember. 20 MR. STRAUCH: That's all right. 21 CAPT KYLE: I just don't, you know, that is 22 10 years ago. We still study that collision as a case

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

occasions, but I don't remember any specific changes in

study, and I have taught that collision on several

23

24

doctrine or procedure or policy that I can point to as a result of that.

We did make a change. I remember as an example, I remember thinking there was a discussion at the time that the operating area that she was assigned, the Houston was assigned to operate in overnight, that accident occurred in conjunction with the filming of a movie. That is what the ship was basically out there for, we were supporting, asked to support the filming of the Hunt for Red October, and there was discussion made at the location of that.

Where those operations were taking place was off Los Angeles, between Los Angeles, Santa Catalina Island, the discussion was made that that was a very sort of inappropriate place to put the ship for extended submarine operations and doing those types of operations because of the very heavy traffic in that area. There was obviously a lot of shipping in and out of San Pedro. It was just not considered a vary optimum place to conduct operations that were not considered critical to the defense of the nation.

So, that, I do remember that part for sure, that operations up in that area were reviewed with a lot of concern, if we sent a submarine up there for any

reason, it would be kind of transited through there, but we are not putting holding areas up there for continued operations off Los Angeles, and I think that still exists today.

We may make a trip through there, but we transit through and keep on going. We don't stay, we don't operate typically off of Los Angeles, it is just not a good -- not an optimum place for a submarine to have to operate because of the contact density.

MR. STRAUCH: Since you are not familiar with it, I won't push this issue with you, but it is interesting that you teach this accident as a case study. Who are the students in the classes that you teach this to?

CAPT KYLE: A few years back I was the prospective commanding officer instructor. One of the elements that we would teach out of that case study is the degree of involvement of the commanding officer in decisions to go to periscope depth, how much was involved, and how do you do the analysis of the periscope depth event, the decisions on what sensors to employ for periscope depth event, and some of the -- some of the follow-on actions, should you be involved in untoward incident, how do you help out, you know,

what are the issues about getting the word to people and dissemination of information out to the rest of the world for help to exist in the recovery of survivors.

MR. STRAUCH: So, it sounds like the students are prospective commanders?

CAPT KYLE: Yes, a submarine commanding officer is selected for command somewhere when he is probably an XO time frame. He goes through a screening board, his record is put up, and he is selected, is going to be a commanding officer.

Then, before he reports to his ship to be a commanding officer, he goes through a six-month training period specifically designed to get him ready, to buff him up on all aspects of being a CO.

Three months of that is spent in propulsion plant training because he will be in charge of that nuclear reactor, and three months of that is spent on what we refer to as the tactics course, but it is really judgment, command leadership, tactical employment, how do you develop teamwork on your ship, and warfare skills, you know how do you do proper target analysis.

So, in that context, in that course, that is the course I was teaching, is a tactics course, a

three-month tactics course, we would spend a lot of time on leadership skills and where other people have gone wrong, what are the lessons learned out of those incidents where people had trouble or previous commanding officers have got themselves into trouble, and what were the lessons or previous incidents and how to take the lessons back, so they are not forgotten.

One of the case studies we have covered, we covered when I was that instructor, was the collision of Houston with the tug.

MR. STRAUCH: Was the selection of this particular accident as a case study, was that something that you made or did somebody else make it and they asked you to cover it in the class?

CAPT KYLE: There is a case study manual or a series -- at that time, we have modified it since then, we have modernized it -- but at that time we had probably 10 or 11 collisions that were selected by probably my predecessor as a PCO instructor, but we would evaluate -- it was our responsibility to maintain this file up to date. As a more current or more relevant incident could come along, we would pick that and maybe replace one of them.

We had a standing file of about a dozen

collisions and a dozen groundings, submarine groundings that occurred, that would be in this case study file. It would be available to every submarine, every squadron, and we had it, all training centers had that, and each ship was required to conduct a certain amount of training out of this inventory every year on a recurring basis, so that these lessons would be told over and over again as a refresher.

MR. STRAUCH: You were talking about teaching the Greeneville accident to prospective COs and at what point they get it, and it is one case among a dozen or so cases.

Are all 12 or so covered or it is up to the instructors?

CAPT KYLE: In the course of the three-month period, we would cover -- we would cover all the cases.

We would do -- we would do them maybe one a night or we would go through a sequence where we would do one every other day or something like that we would cover.

They were edited to the point where you could cover one competently and fully and completely in about an hour, discuss it. It had viewgraphs that showed what happened, the tactical maneuvering and kind of gave you what happened and then the lessons learned,

and we would -- the method of instruction would be let's go through the case, let's read what happened, we would stop the discussion and then discuss what among the students, you know, what do they see as the issues as a teaching method.

MR. STRAUCH: Is that case -- do you know if Commander Waddle was in a class in which this case was covered?

CAPT KYLE: I don't know that for a fact

whether that -- do you know if that is still in the -
I haven't looked at that case study book in a while -
CDR JOHNSON: This is Commander Johnson. No,

I don't know if he studied that in his PCO course, but

I can be almost 99.99 percent confident that he has

seen that case study sometime in his career.

The first time I saw that case study was when I was in submarine officer's advanced course in Groton. This is the course of study part of being a department head. We studied that particular grounding or collision, as well as several other collisions that Captain Kyle has talked about.

CAPT KYLE: I would agree with that. If he didn't cover it at that course, somewhere in his career it was in the library, he had seen it.

MR. STRAUCH: What are the lessons, either of you, what are the lessons that you would like students to get out of the Houston collision?

CAPT KYLE: You asked me cold here. I haven't reviewed, reread that collision. Although I have it in my folder, I haven't had a chance to reread the whole, refamiliarize myself with it all.

As I recall, the issues were --

MR. STRAUCH: Can I interject? I think one of the key issues, as I recall, was that the ship was already at periscope depth, and it was at night, and there was confusion as to the lighting scheme on the tug.

The officer of the deck had not recognized the lighting scheme, that it was a tug with a tow, and failed to recognize that this lighting scheme that was on the left, drawing left, and the lighting on the right, drawing right, was actually the tug was on the left, and the tow was on the right, and he was going right between them.

CAPT KYLE: That was one issue. I do
remember this was analysis, similar in some respects to
this event in that they were in a hurry to get to
periscope depth to copy a broadcast and to get a

NAVSAT, a satellite fix, and so there was some urgency to get up there, and the analysis -- in those days, we had, in order to get a fix, to fix a ship's position, we had to copy a satellite that would pass overhead, 4 GPS, and you had to be there when the satellite rose, and you had to be on time. If you missed the rise of the satellite, you wouldn't get the fix.

They also have a fixed broadcast schedule to get the radio traffic at a certain time starts, and if you miss that time, you miss the broadcast, as well, and so they were in sort of a hurry, they had a lot of contacts, and they were sort of in a hurry to proceed to periscope depth, some urgency involved, and in some regards it was very similar to this case, in that they did not earn contact analysis as well as they should have, they didn't realize this contact was as close as it was when they went to periscope depth.

MR. STRAUCH: One of the things that really surprised me in the last couple of days was how much of the contact determination is really subject to human interpretation, and I guess given the sophistication of the weapon system we are talking about, I mean frankly I found it kind of surprising.

It really depends on the expertise of the

individuals involved, the ability of individuals to access certain paper and pencil materials, and I am sure you are aware that the more you subject something to human interpretation, the more you have manual processes involved, the more likely errors are to be -- are when you throw a wrench into this, such as putting civilians in between somebody's desk and his station.

What are your thoughts about that? Just how much people have to think about things, interpret things to determine whether or not there are vessels on the surface?

CAPT KYLE: Well, you are correct in a sense that it is not -- it is not a totally automated system, and it really depends on trained operators, you have to be a thinking person up there. You can't just turn off your brain and expect everything to be fine, we do spend an awful lot of time from the very beginning training officers and crew members on the principles of target motion analysis, and we try to put into place a series of checks and balances to make sure that it is not a single point safe, dependent on a single individual to make the call on safety to go to periscope depth, so it is an independent review is conducted of the procedures taken to conduct the ascent

to periscope depth.

But it is the nature of the problem that there is no directly automated process by which we can do this analysis without human oversight. We are getting better. There are -- you know, we are in the process of installing systems on the board that are more automated, that have greater capability to do automated analysis of target motion analysis, but to date, none of them, none of those systems by themselves is infallible either. There are assumptions made at each one of those that if not completed, would yield inaccurate results.

So, no matter, even though the machine is providing inputs and consideration, you know, given certain assumptions, this is where the contact would be, it still requires an overall sanity check. It needs a human in the loop to look at this and do an independent evaluation to see that the automated result is, in fact, realistic and jibes with the data that is available to the operator for observation to see that it is correct, and I don't think -- I just don't see even I am very heavily involved in my business of modernizing that whole process and looking at options.

We have got a lot of people, a lot of smart

people working on that for us because frankly, the demands of the country have forced our submarine force into situations where the contact management, the number of contacts operating around a submarine force is greater than it has ever been before.

We are operating in areas now where there are literally scores of contacts in close proximity to our ships, and they have to be able to handle much more -- many more contacts in close proximity to the submarine in past years, much more difficult problem, so we have a tremendous effort in progress to try to come up with mechanical and automated systems to ease the burden on the operator to do all this analysis himself, and there is no simple fix.

We have the smartest people in the world in this arena studying this to come up with answers. So, in order to do this job, and I would agree with you, if there was an automated thing we would go get it, but in order to continue to operate the submarine force, it is going to continue in the near future anyway to require brain power in that process, you know, reasonable conscious people who know what to expect from contact motion to do analysis of the safety of the surface picture prior to proceeding to shallow depth.

So, it is important then, if that is a given, it is important then to establish the proper atmosphere on the ship and the proper procedures in place to ensure that no single individual is the controlling factor of deciding to go to periscope depth, that it is a team process, that there are one or two or three people in the chain, and they all get a nod in agreement that the situation is, in fact, safe.

In no circumstances, I can tell you almost assuredly, unless it is a casualty situation, an emergency requiring immediate surfacing of the boat for survival, that no officer of the deck in any of the submarines in this force or the one in the Atlantic would ever go to periscope depth without the full concurrence and assent of his commanding officer, and that is part of the check.

He, the commanding officer in our setup, the officer of the deck does the initial analysis with his team of people in the control room using the machinery, the plotting, the mental analysis of those people, the machinery analysis to make an assessment that it is safe, and then it is his job to convince the captain in the proper setup, it is his job to convince the captain that it is, in fact, safe to go to periscope depth, and

the captain has to assent to that, make an independent analysis with all of his experience, at that point 15 years of operating submarines, his own experience of getting the boat up to periscope depth.

MR. STRAUCH: One of the things that I kind of see in this accident is that, you know, given, as you know, the fallibility of this process, on the day of the accident, if anything, it appears as if somebody or somehow obstacles were put into proper decisionmaking at the time of the event.

I mean not only was it a key source of information out of commission, but there was one fewer sonar operators in there than there should have been, and a critical element of presenting information to the CO was unavailable because there were civilians in between the FTOW, his station, and where the CEP was displayed.

On top of that you have the inevitable distraction of a bunch of civilians in a very, very crowded environment during what is a pretty -- a potentially very challenging evolution

CAPT KYLE: I can comment on that, if you will.

MR. STRAUCH: Please.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

CAPT KYLE: Again, this is more or less opinion. You know, I am just going to give you my benefit of a lot of riding submarines and watching people do this stuff. Some of this I can't verify yet because some of these guys aren't talking.

I would love to be able to take the CO and XO aside and officer of the deck aside, just tell me what happened, so it is somewhat speculation, and I am going to say that in advance, but the situation here, clearly, when that remote sonar or pager was down, went out of commission.

In my mind, as I think I said on the boat we walked through the other day, in my mind, that would be a big deal, because to me that is a critical piece of equipment for me. That is what I depend on, depended on for years to do my independent evaluation either as driving the boat as officer of the deck, or as a CO of the boat, or even in the post-CO days when I was up there as a senior rider on the boat, senior as a squadron commander watching the ship go, I would always, you know, going to periscope depth, I would look at that and see if it was safe to go to periscope depth. You know, that is just my job.

Without that piece of equipment on board, the

standard procedure for our boats is to write a mitigating set of instructions. The commanding officer, somebody would -- the commanding officer would sign the set of instructions that says with this piece of equipment out of commission, here are the special rules or procedures that we will employ until we get this equipment back. We refer to that as a temporary standing order.

In this case, because it was only a day cruise, it was only going to be out for a few hours, I think they departed from that formality.

There is no question in my mind, my suspicion is if this had been an underway of a week or 10 days or a month or something, and this equipment was down, this boat would have written a temporary standing order to cover that situation, and they would have had that in effect and thought about how they were going to mitigate that casualty.

But I think, my suspicion again, guess, that, geez, we have just get to get through this day, we are busy right now getting all this stuff done, we don't have time to write the standing order, we will just compensate for it for the time being, and the captain probably had in his mind some procedure that he was

going to use to compensate, and he was just going to take care of it.

Regarding the block plot by the people who were standing there, in practicality, in combination with the sonar equipment out of commission, in my mind, if I was to write one of those standing orders, temporary standing orders, I would -- that would be a central element in what the mitigation would be -- I would default to the CEP plot if I was writing that standing order, and say we will use the CEP plot in the meantime, and it will be maintained in such a such a fashion, and it will be, you know, be our central contact analysis station.

But that doesn't mean that that is the only way you can do it. There are modes in the combat system that he can go and get that same information that will be presented on that CEP plot. Whether he did or not, I don't know if he went over and even looked at that, but that information, he needed to do, the contact analysis was available on the combat system, displaying all the contacts and the bearing versus time to do that analysis.

Or he could go into sonar. As I understand it, he did go into sonar, and the XO went into sonar to

look at this, because for he looked on the ASBDU is exactly what is presented in sonar anyway, he can do the same analysis by walking into the sonar room.

So, the fact that that equipment was down is significant in its immediate right, but that is not -- it is not a show-stopper. You have a way to work around that. It is not -- it is not -- it is not a problem.

Now, what was the central issue, why did this break down? I think the real issue is not so much the visitors. The visitors were probably at some -- their present on board was a driver, but those 16 folks that were distributed in that control room, would it have been better if they hadn't been there? Probably, but again, was that a show-stopper? No. We have taken visitors out to sea many times safely, more visitors than that, been in control, and you can operate the ship safely. That is not, that in itself is not a driving issue either.

We have had military people, that many military people in control. When we operate the ship at battles stations, there is more people than that than 16 in control, and yet we can operate the ship in a combat situation with more than 16 people in there.

That is required, that is the stations.

So, the number of folks that were in there, in its own right, is not the issue either. The real issue on this thing is for some reason, the commanding officer, in my opinion again, the commanding officer felt some sense of urgency to get on with the agenda, to get the ship going, headed home, to catch up with the schedule.

Whereas, we like to have this two-party check, the officer of the deck proposing I think it is safe to go to periscope depth, captain, this is the reason why I am justifying why it is safe, in de facto, he was cut out of the loop, and the captain independently was making these decisions to go to periscope depth.

He was driving in his junior to senior relationship, senior to junior relationship, that officer of the deck, and muting, effectively muting his independent analysis of the contact situation, and he captain's judgment as to the safety of the situation topside and the adequacy of the maneuvers and required to do the analysis was faulty.

He did not do an adequate analysis of the sonar situation, and he did not do an adequate analysis

of the visual picture once he got to periscope depth to assess the safety to conduct the emergency main ballast tank blow.

We lost -- we lost the dual party check, and as you said, any given person can make an improper judgment. Unfortunately, in this case, it was the senior guy, and he was -- that exact incident, that exact issue, the danger of falling into that trap was the subject of repeated discussions at that PCO's course when I would teach that course, because personally, my personality is very prone to recall that single man, one-man show. You are the one-man show, you are doing it all, and my personality is such that it is very easy for that to happen to me.

It happened to me in my command tour, I had to be very, very cautious that I did not override the judgment and the feedback of my juniors in making decisions of command level, command level decisions.

I am sure if I asked the current PCO instruction, Captain Neiderhouser [ph], that same discussion is happening today in that class up on the hill.

MR. STRAUCH: I think if we had time, we could talk about some of the human factors issues of

conspicuity of a white hull against a white background when there are waves splashing, and we could talk about some of the other issues, but I do want to ask you a couple of questions in regard to what you said.

With your knowledge of the situation, in your opinion, did the captain violate any written procedures by not fulfilling -- and I am not sure what the term is -- a temporary order because the ASBDU [?] was out?

CAPT KYLE: I don't think the fact that the ASBDU was out violated the procedures, I don't understand that, but he did not -- what is that?

CDR JOHNSON: Search techniques?

CAPT KYLE: How about the sealed standing orders? If we are going to periscope depth, how long does it say to stay on a leg?

CDR JOHNSON: I will have to pull it up and look at it specifically.

CAPT KYLE: Would you pull it out and take a look at it? The sealed standing orders discusses the preparations to go to periscope depth and what you should do, and it says you should analyze contacts on a given leg during passive analysis for a period of at least three minutes before you change course and check it on another leg, and he didn't spend three minutes

there.

I have a little graphic in my bag over there to show the difference in that. If he had stayed for three minutes on his initial leg of 3-4-0, if he had stayed there for three minutes, I think the fact that this contact, the Ehime Maru, would have been, the fact that he was close would have been unmistakable on any sonar display, any contact, any piece of equipment that was still in operation, it would have been absolutely indisputable and clear, and any of his operators in the control room would have seen that and raised his hand and say, hey, this contact is close.

So the three-minute, the lack of the three-minute leg in my mind was a significant deviation from procedure.

MR. STRAUCH: But you said something about filling out a piece of paper regarding a change in procedure or --

CAPT KYLE: Standing order.

MR. STRAUCH: Standing order, because the ASBDU was down.

CAPT KYLE: That is just -- that is just guidance to his watchstanders on how to compensate and mitigate. It kind of highlights to them, hey, this

1	significant piece of equipment is out of commission,
2	and so for his watchstanders, this is how we are going
3	to operate the boat with this equipment down.
4	MR. STRAUCH: It is guidance, but it is not
5	required?
6	CAPT KYLE: Once it is signed, it is
7	required.
8	MR. STRAUCH: But in terms of what the CO was
9	supposed to do, it's guidance. In other words, the
10	fact that he did not fill out the order, he did not
11	violate a procedure.
12	CAPT KYLE: Well, I don't know, let's see, I
13	have to think about that. What requires temporary
14	standing orders?
15	CDR JOHNSON: My understanding, as commanding
16	officer, was that I wrote temporary standing orders to
17	ensure that my crew had my viewpoint, my precautions
18	prior to exercising an evolution because some equipment
19	was out of commission. The requirement for those
20	temporary standing orders was more
21	CAPT KYLE: Right. I don't know if there is
22	a requirement that says
23	CDR JOHNSON: There is no specific written
24	requirement that says you have to write temporary

standing orders. It was good submarining practice.

CAPT KYLE: I am not sure there is, but I will tell you that is commonly it is not, that is a common practice.

MR. STRAUCH: Is there written procedures regarding how, you know, whether to slow up or speed up because you have to get back at a certain time because civilians are there, and they want to get back?

CAPT KYLE: No.

MR. STRAUCH: Are there any specific written procedures regarding what evolutions to perform or not to perform with civilians on board?

CAPT KYLE: No.

MR. STRAUCH: Should there be?

possibly. There are certain procedures that are clearly -- clearly would -- you know, I don't know that that even would be helpful, but there are certain procedures that would not -- that would just be beyond judgment, beyond -- be totally out of, you know, some drills we do, some casualty procedures that we do, and propulsion plant stuff. I just can't imagine anybody would ever in their right mind think of doing some of those things with a civilian on board.

I mean that would not be -- you know, so I don't know. That will be the subject of a lot of thought and discussion whether we have written procedures on that.

MR. STRAUCH: It sounds like as a result of the Houston accident, that there was a change in not doing those kinds of evolutions in the Los Angeles area, but even that wasn't put in writing, is that correct, in your understanding?

CAPT KYLE: I can't say that for sure. All I am saying what they did in the Houston accident was they made a conscious scheduling decision not to operate off Los Angeles. That was the decision at the command level at the oversight, that Los Angeles is not a flight training area, we are not going to go up there and do major naval exercises or operate in a long period of time right off of Los Angeles.

But that is -- that is still a common decision, but I don't know that it was ever written down or it's -- there is not a prohibition of sending a submarine up there. If there is a need to send one up there, we will send a submarine up there, but that is not going to be a place that we can continuously operate.

MR. STRAUCH: Do you think as a result of 1 2 this accident there should be a prohibition against 3 performing of training maneuvers off the coast of 4 Hawaii? 5 CAPT KYLE: No. 6 MR. STRAUCH: Why not? 7 CAPT KYLE: Because there is nothing 8 inherently dangerous in doing training maneuvers off 9 the coast of Hawaii. We have done thousands of hours 10 of training operations off the coast of Hawaii, thousands, safely, without any incident, without any 11 problem. 12 13 We have thousands of hours of operation off the cost of Southern California, off of San Diego, 14 15 without a problem, without incident, and it is necessary, it is absolutely necessary for the continued 16 17 training of our submarine force to do those operations in the proximity of the land, because that is where we 18 do our business in wartime, and that is where we do our 19 20 business on deployment. 21 So, in order to get that training, we have to 22 be able to operate off the coast of land. 23 MR. STRAUCH: And even if that training

includes emergency blows just a couple miles off the

24

coast of a fairly busy port?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CAPT KYLE: Yes. It can be done safely. There is no reason why it cannot be done in a safe manner off the coasts of any reasonable place. keep in mind in this particular day, although they were nine miles off of Honolulu, there was not a heavy contact incident event that day. There were only two or three contacts to contact this tracking. That is a pretty low number, and two of them, even after the ship was surfaced, were not even visible. They were out a long ways away from the ship. There was nobody else out there to even render rescue assistance to the casualty, so there was one guy out there, and that is well within the capacity of the ship if they had followed procedures to handle that contact, and to have conducted this evolution in a safe manner.

So, you know, the practice, if everything had gone right, they would have seen this contact and said, oh, this guy is close, let's relocate or wait until he goes by and make a conscious decision we will go over here, leave this guy behind, go to some other place where there isn't somebody, and it could have been done perfectly safely.

MR. STRAUCH: In your opinion, would there

have been the same kind of emphasis to hurry back if there had not been civilians on board? I guess what I am getting at is if there had only been strictly the ship's crew on board, and they would have been delayed, and they would have had to have spent overnight, would that have been a big deal to the crew?

CAPT KYLE: That was the proximate source of the feeling of urgency on the part of the commanding officer, so in that fact, in that matter, civilians did have an impact on this particular event because they were there, and because there was an agenda there, they were the focus of this operation.

You could go and say, gee, if the civilians weren't there, the ship wouldn't have gotten underway, I mean -- and we wouldn't have had the accident, and that is true, if they hadn't been, that is the only reason the ship got underway to go to sea that day, the Greeneville did, was to take these civilians out, but because there was an urgency to complete the evolution on time, that did drive, I think, was a contributing factor.

Now, it could have been any event. There are other things that could have driven that same sense of urgency - desire to get back before sundown. Gee, I

really don't want to go into port after dark, and if I don't make sundown, I will have to stay overnight, I don't want to go in at night, I won't be allowed to go in at night, or something like that will come up, and that has driven COs to make poor judgment decisions because they are trying to get there before the sun goes down, and whatever agenda they were on, got delayed for whatever reason, and as a result, they kind of hurried up to get back in time.

I can remember in that drowning and collision presentation, the ship I was on before I got there ran aground off San Diego because they were in a hurry to get back to San Diego before dark, and the CO, in that sense, just drove the ship too hard to try to make that timeline rather than slowing down and saying we are not going to make it tonight, we are going to go in tomorrow morning.

Those things are like that, it could be anything that drives the agenda. It happens to be in this particular case, the fact we wanted to get the civilians back by 1600 or whatever and we got a little behind schedule, so that is an issue in that respect, the timeline.

MR. STRAUCH: And inconveniencing the crew

versus inconveniencing civilians, what effect would it have had if it would have been just the ship's crew having to be inconvenienced by spending an extra night that they hadn't planned on?

CAPT KYLE: It would have been a driver nonetheless. It may not have been as strong a driver, but he would have not wanted -- I think in this case, I am really socking at supposition here -- but it wasn't a nighttime deal was not the factor here. He had an agenda to be back at -- I think at 1400, and an approach point to Pearl Harbor pierside at 1500.

There is plenty of daylight yet, so he was really, he was really -- the civilian schedule was probably driving this particular case. They could have easily, if it had just been the crew out there, he could have called up and said I can't make 1500, can I come in at 1600, and they would have -- he would have gotten permission to come in a little late. That is fairly commonly done, something happens, you can't make it, just call up and say I need to come in a little late.

MR. STRAUCH: The last question I have is one of the kind of curious things I think we have all learned in the last couple of days is that the Navy

seems to have a fairly punitive approach to error in its tactical environment, and that goes against current thinking in the field of human error investigations, which takes -- doesn't look at the person committing the error so much as the context of the error and the events that led to that error. If anything, I think their thinking is that taking a punitive approach could disguise some of the antecedents to error and make it even more likely that errors, similar errors would occur in the future.

Would you care to comment on that?

CAPT KYLE: I understand what you are saying, however, the long-standing belief in the Navy, and it's a fundamental principle, is that those responsible are held accountable for their errors.

If they err significantly, they will be held accountable. Now, I don't think, on the other hand, I think that the Navy has softened in that respect.

There was a period of time when one strike and you are out. In this case, many, many cases of, you know, a second chance mentality and, you know, there is no scapegoat. I mean you made a mistake, learn the lessons, get back in there and keep on going.

This is a very, very serious incident, and

there will be probably -- there will be obviously a litigatory investigation. However, I don't think, I really don't believe that -- I do believe, I guess, is a better way to say it, more positively, is that getting to the source of the problem, the root of the issue, what is the bottom line cause is something we also do fairly well at. We will find, we will determine what the bottom line cause of this accident was, and not just pin it on one guy's bad judgment and say his bad judgment, we will take him out, and therefore, the organization is back to -- is okay.

We understand that there are root causes here, programmatic issues that we need to look at - how did this happen, what was the circumstances that were allowed to occur on that ship that took a well-trained officer and allowed him to make -- more than one officer really -- several well-trained people, allowed them to make a poor judgment, and that is always in the back of our mind is how, what environment was existing on that day, despite all this good training we gave this guy, and years of experience he had, how did this still happen, what things were missing, how did we put him in this circumstance, and we will get to the bottom of that, there is no doubt in my mind that we will,

because that's what everybody is wondering, because everybody knows Commander Waddle and his team know what they are supposed to do, and they are probably going through infinite recriminations at this point, why, I know what I was supposed to do, why didn't I do it.

In some fact or another, we, you know, put him in a circumstance where his training was -- didn't protect him. I mean he deviated from established procedures and training, and the stuff he has been trained to do for some reason, there is some motivation there, something that drove him to do that, and we have got to understand that.

MR. STRAUCH: Thank you, Captain.

CAPT KYLE: Here is the document on the ship itself for clearing baffles, preparation to go to periscope. Stay on course 150 feet until there is enough data on the ASBDU and the time-bearing mode on Mark 81-2 displays, which is the back-up, ASBDU is down, but the time-bearing mode of the Mark 81-2 is still available, to determine accurate bearing rate in the direction of relative motion (about 3 minutes).

If deemed appropriate, recommend use of active sonar, usually [inaudible] during baffle clear when operating in vicinity of fishing vessels or

trawlers. Decision to use [inaudible] active sonar for baffle clear must be predicated on favorable environment utilizing the guidance of Article 0511 of a different standing order. That is really the environmental conditions, doesn't make sense.

In addition, pay particular attention to doppler 9 intercepts and any context heard on the racks, which is the underwater telephone. Change course at least to 120 degrees, normally, at 10 knots, to clear the previously baffled area.

Try to select a course that will produce a maximum speed across the line of sight while maintaining the number of maneuvers necessary to get two legs -- minimize the number of maneuvers necessary to get two legs on the contacts.

In general, select a course change that does not put the contact in the baffles, so that it demonstrates a trace on the screen and the effect of ship's changing speed across the line of sight can be monitored.

Conservatively estimate the contact's range based on his bearing rate, fire control, and plot solution.

This is his own writing.

MR. STRAUCH: How can we get that? 1 2 CAPT KYLE: You can have -- we can take this. 3 I don't see that there is anything on this page that 4 is --5 MR. STRAUCH: The previous page begins the 6 classification. 7 CAPT KYLE: It says "C" here, but I am 8 telling you I don't see -- I will look at this and see 9 if this is classified. 10 Assure the sonar contacts on the right are 11 drawing right, and those on the left are drawing left, 12 or that they are drawing astern whenever possible. 13 Achieve this condition with your closest contacts. Ιf the tactical situation is not of concern, take a course 14 15 for best depth control. In this regard, unless a safety course is 16 prescribed, returning to base course after radiated 17 18 noise -- oh, this is a different page. 19 CDR CACCIVIO: The request for that CO 20 standing orders was made. It is on the required list. 21 It is currently in -- it says the whole group of all 22 the documents being evaluated for declassification, and 23 Mr. Roth-Roffy asked that if we removed any enclosures

due to classification, that we simply provide the

24

index, so he could identify what was removed, and so we are continuing down the path that is on the list.

MR. STRAUCH: The standing offers refer to the -- does that refer to the written guidance that I was asking about?

CAPT KYLE: Yes, at least our understanding was. Returning to base course after reaching periscope is generally preferable. When on a steady course, sonar search completed, and it is clear to ascend, inform the commanding officer the status and preparations to bring the ship to periscope depth routine evolutions planned, periscope depth, and all sonar contacts. Request permission to proceed to periscope depth. All that is in here. That is exactly how it is supposed to be done.

LT JOHNSON: Captain, Lieutenant Johnson of the U.S. Coast Guard. I have a couple of questions, if I may. I am going to be asking you questions based on information I know you do not have. These are from interviews with Lieutenant JG Coen and Captain Waddle or Commander Waddle shortly after from a training aspect.

Lieutenant JG Coen indicated in his post-casualty interview that there certainly was a

concern for the PH time, as well as the availability of good dive water, 10,000 yards was all that they had in their northerly course, and they were concerned about being able to complete the evolution with good dive water.

Your thoughts on how that might drive them to do it quickly. I know some of this information is new to you.

CAPT KYLE: I have not reviewed -- I know what that is referring to is the dive water -- they have assigned areas of deconfliction with other submarines where they are allowed to operate. So, this is another urgency thing that is, in my mind, is baloney. You know, it should not be an urgency thing. If you are not comfortable with the area, he can move the ship to a different place, and not be driven to this area boundary.

He is not allowed to be submerged north of such and such a line, and so when he turned to the north, he had to get the blow done, so he is on the surface, and therefore, quote, unquote "legal" to operate, and in my opinion, another bad reason to make a decision.

So, that is another driver that I was unaware

of that was another incentive to get going with the 1 2 procedure in a hurry that is somewhat bogus. 3 CDR CACCIVIO: Like I say, I know this is new and you haven't been aware of it. As a matter of fact, 4 5 I just rediscovered my interview sheet yesterday from 6 this gentleman. 7 When the commanding officer, according to the 8 interview with Lieutenant Coen, made a decision to go 9 to periscope depth, he informed the OD give me the 10 periscope depth, and you have got five minutes to do 11 it. That is according to his interview. 12 13 a common thing? 14 CAPT KYLE: That supports exactly what I was just saying. The commanding officer was driving the 15 OD. That is exactly what I was just telling you. 16 CDR CACCIVIO: Do you think that the presence 17 18 of the chief of the staff had anything to do with that, or it was scheduling, or it was the visitors, or a 19 20 combination of all of them? 21 CAPT KYLE: It was not the chief of staff. 22 It is exactly what I just said a minute ago. He wanted 23 to finish this program on schedule, make a good

impression of his ship to his visitors, get back on

24

time, and not inconvenience those people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CDR CACCIVIO: Normally, does the commanding officer allow the officer of the deck to take as much time as he needs to get to periscope depth?

CAPT KYLE: Absolutely. The minute you say I have to get there in five minutes, you have just -- you have just violated Rule 1, which is you have eliminated that independent thinking of the officer of the deck. He can't make those -- he is a Lieutenant JG, for Pete's sake, he has been doing this business for six months or something, and he is not in the same level, he doesn't have the same experience to fall back on, on contact management, that a guy with 15 years of submarining experience can do, can look at the contacts and make judgments very quickly based on what he has seen because he has seen it gazillion times. This lieutenant has probably seen -- done this maybe 10 times in his life, and to say you have got to get it done in five minutes is an unreasonable request.

CDR JOHNSON: Can I add something real quick?

CAPT KYLE: Five minutes, the five minutes

put the urgency sense in Lieutenant Coen's heart, I

have got to get this done in a hurry, and so he is

going to be more inclined to say -- to say he is ready

when he is really not ready.

CDR CACCIVIO: Through Lieutenant Coen's interview, he made numerous, and I do mean numerous references to the control room was very crowded and it was very confusing in there. I don't remember this, I don't know that it was very confusing, it was very crowded. He continued to say that the entire time.

Is an officer of the deck expected, if he feels like he's -- and I don't want to use the term -- how do I say this -- I don't want to use the term losing control of the situation or being overwhelmed by the factor -- is he free enough to express that to the commanding officer, "Captain, I am uncomfortable, I need to get some people out of here, I need more help in here?"

CAPT KYLE: You would hope so. You would hope so, and --

CDR CACCIVIO: He wouldn't suffer -- he would not suffer anything on a fit rep or any reprimand from the commanding officer for doing that, would he?

CAPT KYLE: I would hope no. I mean I have personally served with commanding officers in days of old, in the bad old days where they were pretty hard over guys that were pretty -- the personality was sort

of A type, A++ type personalities, and if you didn't make them happy, they would take your face off in a second, but -- but knowing Commander Waddle, he is not that type of person, he is not the kind of guy who is going to unload on somebody.

I think if Lieutenant Coen had said I need to get some people out of here, these guys are bothering me, I think -- I think it would have been, especially with the chief of staff there, he would have been sensitive to that, the captain would have been sensitive to it, and they would have done, you know, mitigated the situation for him, or maybe got his more senior officer of the deck up there, you know, he was more comfortable with that.

CDR CACCIVIO: Do you think that the captain would have been aware that this was the first time that Lieutenant Coen had ever participated in an EMBT blow? Should the captain have known that this is an officer who has never done this evolution before or possibly not?

CAPT KYLE: I don't know if he should have known, I don't know. I don't know that I would have remembered that if I was the CO, have you ever done this before, I mean the EMBT blow procedure itself is

not particularly complicated.

CDR CACCIVIO: On the scope, Lieutenant Coen indicated that he, when the scope broke the water, he did three quick sweeps, and the captain took the scope away from him. Those were his words. He never had a chance to do a low power, a slow search and low power for contacts. He did his three turns in a hurry, and as a matter of fact, on the first turn, the scope was experiencing some wave slap. He said it may have actually submerged, I don't remember, but I know it was taking water over it. I got three sweeps. The captain said, "Let me have the scope," and he never got a chance to look in low power.

I don't want to say is that normal, but would the captain normally allow the officer of the deck to satisfy himself as the OD that he, in fact, of the contact picture, with a good, slow search prior to taking the scope from him?

CAPT KYLE: You have got to remember the reason why we were going to periscope depth in the first place, what was the purpose. The purpose was to get a good visual search done.

CDR CACCIVIO: Sure, exactly.

CAPT KYLE: That's the whole reason we went

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

to periscope depth, so it is not normal unless, you know, there are cases, tactical cases where the commanding officer would -- you know if he felt that the situation required the captain's immediate judgment on the tactical situation on the surface, then, the captain, it's not unusual for the captain to take the boat to periscope depth, so he could see immediately, with his own eye, what the tactical picture was.

In combat situations, that is normal. He would take the boat up to periscope depth because you can't afford to -- you know, you are in a combat situation where the length of exposure of the periscope could mean impending attack on your own ship, so you would not typically have a six-month qualified OD take the boat to periscope depth in combat.

So, that is sort of the end of the spectrum, but there is conditions short of that, that you might come up with and say I will take the boat to periscope depth because I want to see the situation immediately.

CDR CACCIVIO: Right. I haven't had the opportunity to see any of the actual deck logs or anything. Lieutenant Coen mentions in here after he came on watch, and while they were doing some of the deep water stuff, they were in the process of shooting

water slugs, demonstration for the guests.

Having been out there, I kind of know, but could you describe the impact that may have on sonar being able to acquire and maintain track of passive contacts during this evolution?

CAPT KYLE: Shooting water slugs only lasts about -- the whole event is over with in about 10 seconds. It's a momentary loss - it will affect the sonar's ability to search for about 10 seconds, because it's a loud noise just behind the sonar itself, but it is not a significant impact on the overall searching capability.

CDR CACCIVIO: Capability is immediately restored after that?

CAPT KYLE: Immediately restored right after it is done.

CDR CACCIVIO: In your experience as a captain, is it common when they announce that they are shooting water slugs for sonarmen sometimes to take their headsets off because they don't actually know the exact time they are going to shoot them to keep from --

CAPT KYLE: What I have seen in most cases, they will turn down the volume on their headphone, and they will keep listening, but they will just turn down

the -- they have a volume control right there on their console. We rarely found people taking off their headphones.

CDR CACCIVIO: Oh, yes, I just have seen that, when they don't know exactly when they are going to pull the trigger.

CAPT KYLE: That's on the bone fish

CDR CACCIVIO: Yes, sir. Ooh, that hurt.

The captain mentioned in his interview that they did have a contact at 340 that faded, and it appears, and I don't know that we asked him, this was a very emotional interview at the time, and then didn't think it's appropriate to ask questions at that time, that there was no attempt to reestablish this contact.

In you being a former CO of submarine, if you were going to maneuver your vessel in the direction of a contact that you had faded and gone through the CMBT evolution, would it be prudent to try to reestablish that contact to ascertain any type of range information you may have?

CAPT KYLE: The contact at 340, he was doing his major clear going to periscope depth and everything at course 120. 340 had put that contact in the port baffles.

1	CDR CACCIVIO: Yes, I am talking about after
2	he finished that and was actually conducting his
3	emergency deep just prior to blowing.
4	CAPT KYLE: He is still in the baffles.
5	CDR CACCIVIO: He altered course in the
6	transition, the left full rudder to course.
7	CAPT KYLE: 340.
8	CDR CACCIVIO: 340. So, he is coming back to
9	that area.
10	CAPT KYLE: Right to that side, but he has
11	also increased speed.
12	CDR CACCIVIO: Yes, sir.
13	CAPT KYLE: And it is incumbent upon him, you
14	know, in my experience again, is to go through each
15	contact that you have on the sonar, and that is why you
16	are using passive sonar. It is the most sensitive.
17	You are most likely to detect any contact on the
18	passive sonar system. That's the most sensitive
19	sensor.
20	CDR CACCIVIO: Yes, sir.
21	CAPT KYLE: For the longest range. So, you
22	would go down, you would take a look at all those
23	contacts and either resolve in your mind that the

target, the contact, and the sonar, held in the sonar

24

at such a range that it is not going to be visible, or if it is visible -- even if it isn't, you would look down at each bearing of each sonar contact to see if I can see them. If it is clear from the sonar analysis, the contact is at 20 miles, you are not going to see that contact with your periscope. If it's within 10,000 yards, within 5 miles, you should be able to see them. You need to go, continue to search until you see where that contact is.

CDR CACCIVIO: Yes, sir. In the last question I have for you, Captain, the fire control solutions that are generated and updated, is there any kind of permission or notification required of the officer of the deck if the fire control technician is to change that solution, to update that solution that you are aware of?

CAPT KYLE: Not in a normal steaming watch.

That is his job to maintain the system solution up to date, but it is incumbent upon him to notify the commanding officer of any, or the officer of the deck, of any contacts that appear to be threatening given the set to periscope depth or close CPAs, and when I say "close CPAs," I mean CPA within 4,000 yards or so of the ship.

1	CDR CACCIVIO: Thank you, Captain, that is
2	all the questions I have.
3	MR. WHITE: I would like to take a brief
4	break at this moment.
5	[Off the record.]
6	MR. WHITE: We are back with our interview of
7	Captain Kyle, and I believe Lieutenant Kusano had a
8	question.
9	LTJG KUSANO: This is Lieutenant Kusano.
10	Good morning, Captain.
11	CAPT KYLE: Good morning.
12	LTJG KUSANO: I guess I will just bring kind
13	of a general perspective and former OD on a surface
14	ship.
15	You mentioned the captain driving the ship
16	and how dangerous that would be. Have you ever heard
17	the term, "I am just a parrot on the bridge?"
18	CAPT KYLE: No, I haven't heard that, but I
19	know what you mean. The captain is issuing all the
20	orders, and you are just relaying, you are just a
21	mouthpiece of the captain.
22	LTJG KUSANO: You mentioned where ODs should
23	know better to speak out if there is a dangerous
24	situation. In your experience as commanding officer,

how often did that ever happen?

CAPT KYLE: It takes a -- the problem with it is most junior officers, if they know is wrong in their heart of hearts will tell -- you know, they will tell a captain I don't think that is right, but if there is a doubt in their mind, you know, that is what I worry about, if there is doubt in his mind, he will say, well, I don't feel comfortable with this, but the captain feels comfortable, so he has a lot of experience, I will go with it, and that is the dangerous part, because he won't answer the doubt.

I mean if it is clearly something the captain is forgetting, that doesn't bother me so much because most people will say, hey, you forgot to consider this. This is obviously something wrong. He will probably raise his hand and say, you know, point at it and say this is wrong, because the officers are well trained, and they want to do the right thing, and they are trying, but it is that question, that question in their minds is gee, I am not that comfortable, but that is because I am not experienced, he has got all the experience, he has got 15 years ahead of me, it must be okay, the captain. I trust the captain implicitly, he's my, you know, he's the captain, so I am not going

to talk to him about it.

LTJG KUSANO: I guess it would depend on the personality or how strong the officer of the deck or the JO is.

CAPT KYLE: Certainly, and the relationship between the captain and that individual.

LTJG KUSANO: Relationship. I have both a screamer and then I had a CO who was just mellow, just let the OD do the job. What I found interesting was a lot of accidents were always with COs on the bridge, and with knowing that, I know on the surface program they don't really teach us, hey, if you guys have a problem, you know, let your captain know, let your captain -- that was really not emphasized.

Do some JOs, when they go through their training, are they ever instructed, that kind of information?

CAPT KYLE: Yes, they are. We teach that repeatedly, that it is the team concept, everybody has a voice, and teaming is the way we succeed. As Advias Barrio [ph] was saying if you get down to a one-man show or a single person, you are only as good as that person is, and we know every person is fallible. There isn't anybody that doesn't make mistakes. That's a

human frailty, and if that is what you are depending on, is one person, some mistakes will happen. So it's double-check.

All of our procedures on the boat are based on double, two-person, the rig for dive, classic example, rig a boat for dive to get ready to submerge.

It's the First Petty Officer, second checker is an officer, and we go, we do everything double.

If we are going to hang a tag out to place a piece of equipment out of commission for maintenance, we will put, one person will hang the tag, the second person will double-check the tag. There is always two people in the line because we recognize the fact that any given person, that's just the way God made people, they are not perfect, and they all make mistakes, but we hope, and we are pretty confident that two people in a row will not make the same mistake.

LTJG KUSANO: Isn't it also there have been cases of experienced ODs saying in other accidents where they have just been quoted as saying in investigations, I will just let the CO drive the ship and let him get into trouble, I mean that is something that hopefully, it wouldn't happen, but do you think that is possible that something like that could happen

ever? I mean I hope it doesn't, but it has happened in surface fleet.

CAPT KYLE: I am sure -- I am sure there are people who have thought that way, you know, if you are under a -- especially a guy that is pretty hard to deal with, doesn't take criticism well, that there are cases where, you know, screw it, you know, it's his problem, it's his neck.

But I don't think that was the case here.

That is not -- Commander Waddle was highly respected by his crew. I mean I think that becomes clear in anybody you have discussed this with, and there was not a case where they were trying to get him or not tell him about problems.

Now, I do want to point out, I would like to

-- there were some questions during our break about

this five-minute get to periscope depth thing. That is

not -- that is not an unachievable effort. I mean I

don't want to say that is not, you know, that there

aren't conditions where getting to periscope depth in a

fairly short order is not required, but that is

unusual, and you certainly would not need that -- you

know, you need all the people there kind of at working

their best, you would probably not let -- you would

probably talk to the officer of the deck, we need to get to periscope depth in five minutes. What that really means is you drive the boat harder, you would use more power, you would turn rudder, you would turn the ship faster to get over to your second leg and your first leg. It doesn't mean you cut any of the requirements to go up, you still have to do all that stuff.

You still need to try to get two good legs, preferably up to 3 minutes, I know 3 plus 3, that is greater than 5, but you want -- ideally if you have been on a given course, that could count as your first leg, so you have got good data coming in, so you say I have got good data on this leg, I need to change course in a hurry, get over to the next leg, get 3 minutes of data, and get the periscope up.

What that means is expedite, move things

fast, get on with it, and drive the issue hard to get

up to periscope depth. That can be done, but what I

was trying to say is that Commander Waddle, in making

that statement, placed a sense of urgency, an

unnecessary sense of urgency in this case, because

there really was no tactical requirement to go up other

than you say I am behind my schedule, put a sense of

urgency on the back of Lieutenant Coen, and whether he was capable or had the skills to execute that safely at a 5-minute, you know, aggressive trip to periscope depth, I don't know. I don't know his level of training.

He is a fairly junior OD, Lieutenant JG, I think a couple of months probably, 6, 5, 7, 8 months, something like that, he probably hasn't driven the ship that much, and so he is going to need help.

If you want to get up at 5 minutes, he is going to need help in doing the contact analysis to get up there that quickly.

LTJG KUSANO: One last question, sir. I guess from your experience, from your days of being an OD and junior officer to being a commanding officer, what would you say would allow a JO to speak out in an incident like this, would it be personality or what would be the most important factor, personality or experience?

CAPT KYLE: I can't say either one of those.

You need both of those. Experience, personality, the personality is probably the strongest because if he knows that he is not experienced and has a forthcoming personality, you say, "Captain, I am over my head here,

I don't understand it."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And it is just, I can't emphasize that I mean I can remember having these discussions enough. with a lot of my ODs when I was a CO, I said, look, you know, I operated my ship out of San Diego, which is frankly a lot more traffic than here, certainly a lot more than three contacts held off Diamondhead, and, you know, we are trying to get to periscope depth, I repeatedly would tell these guys, say don't sit up here by yourself struggling to get to periscope depth, try to do these contacts. If you slow down and come up to 150 feet to do this analysis, and you have got six or seven contacts, they are brand-new, that you have no tracking data on, that you are trying to resolve, call me immediately and we will come up and work the problem together. You know, we will go through this and work the problem.

During that process, it was always when I went up there, you would try to go and say I am going to let the guy do his job, and I will watch him do it, so you can advise him on courses to choose, and so forth, to optimize the trip. A lot of this is trying to figure out where do you want to go to drive the ship to get the most data, the most efficient data to

resolve the target picture.

So, I think to answer your question, that is long, roundabout, I am rambling here, but I think the personality is probably number one, and then -- because even if you don't have much experience, if you know you don't have the experience and you have the personality, you can say I am just a little uncomfortable with this, raise his hand, and get the help up there is the right way to go, and that is they way he is going to get the experience is by asking for help and get people to show him the procedures.

LTJG KUSANO: I guess I lied, sir. Based on the personality part, when they go through their initial interview to come into the sub program, during the interview process, what types of -- are they looking for certain types of personalities or --

CAPT KYLE: Oh, yeah.

LTJG KUSANO: -- is it more just knowledge based?

CAPT KYLE: No, it is definitely -- it is both. You have got to have the right knowledge, but you have also got to -- they put you in a stressful situation right there on the spot, and they check your reaction to stress and how you handle those kinds of

situations right off the bat.

They know the kind of personality. They have been doing these kind of interviews for almost 50 years now, and they know the kind of people they are looking for in terms of their reaction to the type of questioning and stuff they get when they come to the interviews.

LTJG KUSANO: Thank you, sir.

LT JOHNSON: Lieutenant Johnson with the United States Coast Guard. Captain, I have only two more questions for you.

I was thinking about a question I had asked you earlier about this 5-minute to periscope depth issue. In your experience, in your opinion, when would the most dangerous point in the transition be from 150 feet to periscope depth?

CAPT KYLE: Just before getting to periscope depth.

LT JOHNSON: Why is that, sir?

CAPT KYLE: Because you are right there at the interface. You can't see, you don't have your visual sensor up. The ship, the submarine is in proximity to strike another ship, shallow enough to sail, it's just below the water line, you know, 10 or

12 feet down, and you are not seeing yet. That is the period you are most uncomfortable.

LT JOHNSON: You are pretty much vulnerable in the fact in that transition period there is a point in that where you are blind and people can't see you, other than your sonar data, you can't see them, they can't see you, but you are still in a collision --

CAPT KYLE: You are a navigation hazard. You are a navigation hazard to those other ships.

LT JOHNSON: Exactly. I thought about that after I asked the question, so in saying you have got five minutes to get to periscope depth, in all actuality, if a commanding officer tried to minimize the time in that dangerous transition area, in retrospect, to me, doesn't seem that uncommon or off the wall. Is that a fair statement?

CAPT KYLE: No, no, the 5 minutes to periscope depth is like starting from ground zero. He hasn't really started this detailed review of his contacts, he has to go through that process. He has to make the course change to make sure there is no contacts overhead.

The transition from 150 feet to periscope depth, I have an internal standard that it should not

take more than 3 minutes to do that. If it takes more than 3 minutes, there is something wrong in the training and procedures being done on a ship.

Sometimes thermal climb will do that to you. You get to the point where as you are coming shallow, the temperature of the water changes. If it gets warmer, the boat gets heavier, and so as you are coming up, the boat suddenly starts to stall, because your overall buoyancy is reduced, and you get stalled, and that is not an uncommon process, and that is indicative of a faulty procedure or lack of training between the officer of the deck and the diving officer watch, and that is not a very safe thing because when you stall, typically, the thermal climb starts up there at 80 feet or something and right there is, it hits the barrier and the boat can't get up.

So, now the boat is sitting a 80-foot keel depth, the sail is 50 feet above, it's 30 feet below the water line, certainly a large ship could strike the ship, you can't see, and the boat is stalled there, and the only answer is to put on propulsion to push through that, put on more speed on the submarine to push through that layer.

(301) 565-0064

LT JOHNSON: Punch it up.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.

CAPT KYLE: Punch it up there, and that takes 1 2 a little time to build, and very uncomfortable in that 3 process. You want to minimize that time up from 150 to 4 the surface to get a good look around. 5 LT JOHNSON: I felt, in retrospect, in 6 walking around and thinking, I though it was important 7 to get that into the record, as well, that there is a 8 dangerous zone in that transition where you are blind, no one can see you, you in effect are a hazard to 9 10 navigation. The only other question I have is just so you 11 know, Lieutenant Coen qualified as OD in June, so that 12 13 is about his experience level there. Can an OOD request to be relieved at any 14 time, if he is uncomfortable? 15 CAPT KYLE: Yes, sir, yes, he can. 16 LT JOHNSON: Can he make that request to the 17 18 captain or any other qualified OOD on the vessel? CAPT KYLE: He should, no, if he wants to be 19 20 relieved, there is discussion of that in the standing 21 orders, the Navy regs, it says he should request that 22 from his captain. 23 And this was available to LT JOHNSON:

Lieutenant Coen at any time he felt uncomfortable?

24

CAPT KYLE: It is a pretty big step, though.

Most people -
LT JOHNSON: That was my next question was

what the ramifications to an OOD who gets there and

says, you know, I am out of my comfort zone here, and

it appears that he is, and to quote Lieutenant Kusano,

he is becoming nothing more than a parrot. I am

responsible because I am on the logs as the OOD, but I

9 am just parroting the captain, I am uncomfortable with

10 this.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

[Pause.]

LT JOHNSON: My question is going to

Lieutenant Kusano about the parroting, you have got an

OOD on the bridge who feels like I am not comfortable,

I am nothing more than a parrot to the captain, I am on

record, I am responsible.

What are the ramifications potentially to that OOD if he says, captain, you know, sir, I respectfully request to be relieve of office of the deck responsibilities, can that be a career ender for him?

CAPT KYLE: No.

LT JOHNSON: A fit rep, black eye?

CAPT KYLE: I don't think so. It may -- I

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

can't answer that question, it could be anything. I
mean I expect it could have negative effects in the
view of his commanding officer if the commanding
officer's disposition is to be that way, hey, this guy
has taken me on, I am going to get him, but again, I
don't think in this case, Commander Waddle, you know,
if anything, if he had said that, you know, what it
would have probably done is set up alarm bells in
Commander Waddle's mind, why is this guy asking this,
maybe I am -- am I overstepping my bounds here.

You know, I don't know. I don't think

Commander Waddle would hold it personally against him
just knowing Commander Waddle.

Questions, I know a lot of it just calls for trying to get in the other guy's mind so to speak, but like I said earlier, in the interview with Lieutenant Coen, the thing that just kept surfacing on a regular basis was it was very crowded, very confusing in the control room, and I got the sense of watching him and listening to him that he was in a situation that he was not comfortable with, and I keep asking myself why didn't he bring that to the attention of the captain if he was uncomfortable.

That is kind of just so you know why I am 1 2 looking at this. 3 CAPT KYLE: I don't think -- I don't think 4 that would have had a 5 LT JOHNSON: Negative effect. 6 CAPT KYLE: My guess, if you are asking for 7 speculation, is he may have felt uncomfortable, but for 8 a lot of us, we felt uncomfortable driving ships when 9 you are learning how to do it, and that is part of it, 10 you know, it is like you wouldn't do anything new if you were comfortable with everything, you know, you 11 12 wouldn't make any forward progress on anything. 13 A lot of what you have to do the first time is you have to -- you know, the first time you do any 14 15 event, get on a bicycle to ride it, you are a little 16 uncomfortable. I may fall over and hurt myself, but I 17 am going to learn how to ride this bike, and you get on 18 it, and you may fall over. 19 LT JOHNSON: Do you think the chief of staff 20 being in there put a little sweat being on the OOD's 21 head? CAPT KYLE: I don't know if it made a sweat, 22 23 but he in his mind most likely says I am uncomfortable, 24 but I can do this, I am a hacker, I will make it

through.

LT JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. I don't have anything else.

LTJG KUSANO: This is Lieutenant Kusano again, based on Lieutenant Johnson's questions.

I know from experience on the surface, the way they had the fit reps, where you rank, where you rank early promote, must promote, and promotable, I don't know how it is in the sub world, but I remember as a JO, when we get our fit reps, where it was oh, oh, that is so-and-so, oh, that's the one who was progressing, and it was kind of, in the award room, you have so many JOs, and you know who got those positions, and I recall where you didn't want to mess up because you didn't want to be that person that was promotable, you didn't want to be that progressing individual.

Do you think that could play a factor for JOs?

CAPT KYLE: We have tried to take, especially for Lieutenant JGs, we don't put them in all those categories anymore because we feel that it is ridiculous, you know, if we have got guys who are sweating that stuff out, and it is ridiculous at the Lieutenant JG level, and so what is it we give them --

everybody is promotable.

LTJG KUSANO: I remember it almost created a back-stabbing environment.

CAPT KYLE: We saw that, took that off the table, so for particularly the junior guys, I mean get a little more senior, the department head level, and stuff, yes, you are in the competition business, and we kind of have to do that, but at the junior level, you are just learning your job, nonsense. We just said take that off the table, we are just going to write everybody promotable, everybody gets the same grade, and as long as you are not, you know, unsatisfactory, I mean you have an option to have that in there, but most of the cases it will be just the same as everybody else.

So, I don't think that is an issue here, because at the junior grade level, you would get sort of a generic evaluation there.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: This is Tom Roth-Roffy. I would just like to follow up a little bit on the training issue.

Do you have, as part of your work-ups for deployment, a simulator training in which the team of people in the control work together as a team to

develop team skills? In the surface world, they call it bridge resource management; on aircraft, they call it cockpit resource management.

Does submarine training have a similar concept or training evolution?

CAPT KYLE: I mentioned in my previous statement that we would go to the training center. Up there, and you will see it later this week, you will go up and see we have essentially, exactly what you are talking, a Tact Team Trainer, and that is where they go up and practice the team skills of driving the ship in a tactical situation on a section basis.

You saw -- well, you haven't seen yet -- but you are going to see also on Tuesday the Ship Control Team Trainer, and that is for coordination of the people on the helms, the planesmen, chief of the watch, diving officer of the watch, to get their team working together.

We have the Piloting Team Trainer to teach the navigating party of the ship how to pilot in and out of port, how to work his team.

We have the Fire-Fighting and Damage Control
Team Trainer to teach those guys how to do teamwork.

It's over on Ford Island.

So, yes, there are numerous team training venues available.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: Is there a team training for the sort of evolutions that the crew, or the office of the deck and the captain were doing, going to periscope depth, doing a search, and doing the emergency deep, would that sort of training --

CAPT KYLE: That is sort of an integrated training event. It transitions from a contact management event where you are planning to go to periscope depth, and the attack team training, laboratory or trainer would focus on that skill, and that is really one group of people in the control room work that.

The emergency deep and emergency surface procedure, that is the ship control side, and that would be trained on in a Ship Control Team Trainer. It really all comes together on the ship itself, so you work these different teams together, and the integrated product is trained on, on board, and you put all that together in one place.

To answer your question, we don't have a direct notification on the entire submarine all in one fell swoop ashore that would give you common -- in the

concept of an airplane cockpit that flies, and it is basically the whole control station is right there, but even an airline, as I understand it, an airline simulator, you don't have the seats in the back and the flight attendants, and all that, where the work, and I don't know, maybe they do, but I wouldn't think you would have a trainer that has a whole airplane there. I don't know, maybe there is, but I would think that would be crazy to buy something like that, too expensive.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: During the at-sea training portion, is it also a testing portion where they are evaluated on their skills, and how do you separate the training from the appraisal aspects of the at-sea portion?

CAPT KYLE: The appraisal portion is very clearly delineated, when that is going to occur. It's at the end of the game, but there are workup periods ahead of time when the squadron and our staff, my staff, Commander Johnson's folks will go out and work with the team in the training standpoint.

It is very clearly understood when the evaluation starts. The boss comes down, the commodore comes down and looks at the ship, but that is not to

say that even during the evaluation we aren't doing training. We believe that we are training all the time. Anytime anybody is on the ship they are training, working problems.

So, you know, it is sort of like, well, when I was squadron commander and I came down to ride the ship, we would start out on day one, and I am evaluating the ship. I am going to give them a grade at the end, I am going to tell them where the strengths and weaknesses are, but it is not a deal where we come down and just write notes and keep them to ourselves, and sign a grade at the end of the week.

At the end of the day or at the end of the evolution, we will sit down and critique as we go, so that we have constant improvement, even when I am out doing the evaluation.

You know, it doesn't do me any good, it doesn't do the ship any good to hold these things as a secret to the end of the week or the end of the at-sea time and say here is your list of things you screwed up this week, and you are either sat or not sat.

We will hand those comments out as we go and work to improve as we are out there. It is clear in the ship's mind when the evaluation is occurring,

because usually the boss comes down, but in the meantime, there will be a lot of work ahead of time to prepare the ship and make sure it is ready for that inspection.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: I have heard in the surface
Navy that there has been a reduction in emphasis in the
examination of proficiency and more towards training
because I understand the ships were spending all of
their time in a lot of stressful situations preparing
for these various examinations.

Has there been any similar shift in the submarine service?

CAPT KYLE: Yes, yes, there has. We used to run an exam on our ships called the "tactical readiness exam," and it was the same deal. We put that in the schedule, and it would cause a lot of angst and a lot of work and a lot of, you know, at-sea time and fervor to get these guys underway, and we are finding that we were really running the ships extremely hard and really hard on the crews because of that.

We were at sea a lot, and there was sort of a redundant inspection process. We would have a commodore's inspection getting them ready for the tactical inspection, so there would be pre-inspections

and a real inspection. They would work up for the commodore's inspection, and then they would go to the next one.

So, we decided to consolidate that now to the commodore's inspection with participation of the same folks that used to do the tactical readiness exams with the commodore's inspection, so we kind of combined the two into one event, so we get the same kind of data, but without cycling the ship through multiple inspections of the same area to get more efficiency out of the process.

We, today, do not have enough submarines to do all the tasking that we have to do. We are working harder today out there than we ever have before for two reasons. The number of taskings have gone up, which is contrary to what you would think, the Cold War is over, think everything is great, but it isn't. There is a lot of stuff going on in the world that we are involved in.

The number of taskings have gone up, the number of boats have come down. We have downsized the size of the military, the number of submarine force, so the only answer is we have got to be, to answer that call, we have to become more efficient in the time we

have to work with the ships and what they do.

We can't be wasting time with multiple inspections of the same area, you know, kind of overkilling that thing. So, yes, we have reduced it, but I think we are still okay in that respect in terms of number of reviews and oversight. We are very careful about reducing that inspection.

That was a challenge given us by the Chief of Naval Operations back in 1998-99. He said we have got to reduce the interdeployment training load on all of our ships and air squadrons, and we responded to that.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: Could you describe the cycle time for these workups, the deployment and the return, and where in that evolution or that cycle was the Greeneville?

CAPT KYLE: The cycle time varies. This is an area of great interest right now because before this incident occurred, that was consuming most of my time working this particular issue.

The cycle time for most of the operating ships is down to what we refer to as a 2.0 turnaround ratio. They go on deployment for six months and will return, and will deploy again 12 months later. Twice the amount of time they are back. That is the bare

bones minimum that the Chief of Naval Operations will 1 2 allow us to turn a ship around is 2 times the 3 deployment length. 4 So, we are hovering. Most of our operating 5 ships are hovering right now in 2.1 to 2.2, to 2.3 6 maybe turnaround ratios, somewhere in that zone. Some 7 of them are actually at 2.0. 8 Greeneville has been back for a while. Let's see, she -- I am not familiar, I have lost it right 9 10 She had a slight restricted availability in 11 there, so she has been back a while, but I don't know where her next deployment is in the cycle. I would 12 13 have to look that up, I don't remember. She is not in 14 this POM process. 15 She has gone to EASTPAC after the SRA, and I think she is -- she is definitely not in the POM 16 17 process, I would have known that. Like I say, when 18 people enter the POM, they kind of get special 19 treatment, so she is just in the middle of a cycle, 20 probably to deploy in --21 CDR JOHNSON: Her wideband install is like

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

early next year, early in 02, so it would be six months

So, she is ways away. She is

after that, I think it would be summer of 02.

CAPT KYLE:

22

23

24

just a ship on line out here doing her normal training and sustaining of readiness. Ideally, we would like to have them out there at 2.8 to 2.9 to 3.0. It makes it a much more achievable schedule.

I think Greeneville must be -- she is

I think Greeneville must be -- she is probably a little longer than that, she is probably well beyond the average, because she has several maintenance things that are in her slot.

I have said several times, well, she doesn't have this modernization, she doesn't have that, she doesn't have that, so we are trying -- she is back here now. She will have a series of modernization periods to get her equipment up to the fleet standard right now. Unfortunately, now, she will deploy even later, I think, because she will be in dry dock or a while here I think.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: Any estimate of the damage, the repair periods?

CAPT KYLE: They are estimating a minimum of 38, 37 days, something like near 40 just to replace the SHT that was torn. That is a very complex process.

You have got to put that stuff on there, cure it, heat it, all this kind of stuffy.

They have to look at the rudder, the

circularity issues, and the hull casting, health and welfare of the hull. If the rudder is severely damaged, there is significant damage underneath that rudder, that can greatly extend the availability.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The last time we had a major damage to a rudder on a submarine, somebody was telling me the story -- I remember the case -- two submarines collided during an exercise, and that submarine was tied up for like six or eight months while they fixed that rudder. The rudders, the Greeneville has a special propeller, you know, unique propeller, unique stern planes configuration, so although we have a lot of decommissioned ships around, she is one of like three or four submarines that have a special design, so we don't have decommissioned ships to go pull these major castings from, major components, and if there is some serious damage in there in some of the steering gear, we might turnaround a contractor and starting over again with building some equipment, which would be a lengthy delay.

It works well enough for surface operations, but we have got to go in and do some more looks in the dry dock to see. If there is something else wrong back there, we have got to understand it better.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: Often we get a damage estimate from the owner of the vessel. At this time, are you able to, have you provided anybody with an estimate of the damage to the submarine?

CAPT KYLE: I have told you everything that I know in terms of media equipment, stuff that has been done. We will have to get back to you. Until we get into dry dock and do some of these other detailed measurements that require dry-docking, we won't be able to give you a full assessment.

That is one of the main reasons we are going in, because we need to go in and do that stuff. You have got to measure the circularity of the hull, you have got to go in and look at some of these hull castings to see if they are cracked, and we have got to get in that steering gear area, which we can do it from waterborne, but it is a lot easier doing it in dry dock.

As you have seen on the ships, the actual rudder, steering gear, and everything is always on surface is submerged, so you have to go in with divers to look at that stuff. It is pretty tough if you are waterborne.

MR. ROTH-ROFFY: I think that is all I have

I would like to pass the interviewing to Bill 1 2 Woody. 3 MR. WOODY: -- use ESM or is ESM operator 4 involved? 5 In my mind, normal CAPT KYLE: Yes. 6 procedure for doing this event, you would want an 7 all-sensor search, periscope depth. You would do your 8 initial look probably at 60 feet or 58, depending on 9 the sea state, 58 feet, and then the next step would 10 be, more importantly really, the next step would be to 11 come significantly shallower, you know, down to 50 feet or something like that, get the scope very high. 12 13 During that time, that would give the ESM operator plenty of time to do a full search of all 14 15 bands, and for yourself, to really assess out in the CON, listening to early earning receiver, of any strong 16 17 radar contact that was imposing, you know, radiating on 18 the periscope. You would hear that strong pulse. I think the normal procedure for doing the 19 20 pre-search, the safety search of the immediate area at 21 periscope depth would be to deploy the periscope well 22 including the ESM system on the top of there to see if

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC. (301) 565-0064

MR. WOODY: Would you discuss the character

there is any close contacts.

23

24

of the operating area where the Greeneville was operating, the pros and cons perhaps, whether it is a good area, a bad area, shipping lines, anything that you can think of?

CAPT KYLE: We have operated there fairly frequently. I have been out there. The operating area, the classic traffic around Honolulu is out of Honolulu Harbor on the south side of Oahu, and the shipping generally has one of two directions, eastbound to the Continental United States, and they will proceed right along the southern shore of Oahu, just past Diamondhead, probably not more than 4 to 6 miles off the coast of Oahu, just outside -- you know, well off the reef, but not that far to sea because it is out of their way.

They would cut along the coast of Oahu, southern coast of Oahu, and then turn north through the Kaiwi Channel between Oahu and Molokai and then proceed to the Continental United States or even further south to head for Panama or something like that.

There is also significant barge traffic between Honolulu and the other islands, but again that follows almost the same shipping lane. If you are going eastbound to one of the eastern islands, Maui or

the big Island of Hawaii, they would head the same way this time crossing Kaiwi Channel to Molokai, then south of Molokai and then up either to Maui or to the Big Island, but they would also be transiting fairly close to the shoreline of Oahu for the initial period.

This operating area is seaward of where this boat was operating, it is seaward of that general shipping area. Up closer to Honolulu, in the evening time, again well north of where we were, where the Greeneville was on this day, there is significant dinner cruise traffic right up along the Waikiki coastline, but that is only a mile or two off the beach, very close into land.

The only people heading south out of

Honolulu, as far south as 9 miles south, are typical,
an occasional fishing ship going, not that much traffic
happens coming down south out of Honolulu. There is
nothing south of Hawaii. I mean it goes, it is a long
ways down there. Nine miles is really out of the way
for most traffic.

If you look at that chart there, you can see just the layout of the state. Barge shipping going to Maui or the Big Island, across that area of shallow water there, called Penguin Bank, will come straight

off of Honolulu, head between Molokai and Linai, and then either go to Maui or will cut north through that channel, north, either that way or down along the coast of Maui down to the Big Island.

There is a port on the north side of Maui, that is their main shipping port, so they will go around the north side there to Kahului. There is some traffic that comes out of Honolulu, heads westbound toward Kawai or to Japan.

If they are going to Japan, they will follow that line that says Hula straight up and merchant traffic will head up that direction towards Japan or to the Far East. But there is not much that goes out as far as -- there is no real reason to go out as far as 9 or 10 miles off of Honolulu.

There are places where there is less traffic, but it not a heavy trafficked area. If you go out 60 miles south, for instance, if we do weapons' detonations or something like that, we are going to do weapons deployment, we will go out 50 to 70 miles southwest of Honolulu, and basically, there is nobody out there. The traffic is very, very thin.

You will see an occasional fisherman go by, but not much else.

1	MR. WOODY: Thanks very much. That is all
2	the questions I have.
3	MR. ROTH-ROFFY: With no further questions
4	being tendered, the time is 1039, and that concludes
5	our interview with Captain Kyle.
6	[End of interview of Captain Kyle.]
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	